Shrimad Vallabhacharya

HIS PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

SHRIMAD VALLABHACHARYAJI (A.D. 1479-1530)



J. G. Shah

Vallabhacharya—His Philosophy And Religion

PUSHTIMARGIYA
PUSTAKALAYA,
NADIAD.
(INDIA)

SHRIMAD VALLABHACHARYA
HIS PHIOSOPHY AND RELIGION

J. G. SHAH

The Pushtimargiȳa Pustakalaȳa,
Nadiad (INDIA.)

SHRIMAD
VALLABHACHARYA
HIS
PHILOSOPHY
AND
RELIGION

J. G. SHAH

THE PUSHTIMARGIYA
PUSTAKALAYA
NADIAD (INDIA).

Shrimad Vallabhacharyaji

A prophet of Divine love and an eminent religious revolutionary, Vallabhacharyaji (A.D. 1479-1530) was a brilliant philosopher of distinction, gifted with superb genius, characteristic of India's great philosophers. His masterly and numerous treatises on philosophy have not much spread beyond his followers; once the curtain is raised, it is certain that he will shine out as one of the most resplendent luminaries in the galaxy of the world philosophers. At a time when India was passing through agonising turmoil and confusion both social and spiritual, he encountered the challenge of the time and went to the people, touring the country thrice with enchanting and fresh message of glory and grandeur of life. His influence was such that he succeeded in introducing a faith based on the principles of Universal Love, Beauty, Joy and Oneness of life. He introduced Krishna, the incarnation of God as manifestation of divine love and grace and the Source of supreme Bliss. His religious conceptions of welcoming all into his faith, irrespective of caste, community, creed or sex, inspired classes and masses everywhere.

His philosophy was practical. He had perfect definition of the love of God for it states that we must love God for His own sake and ourselves and everything else for the sake of God. His divine love is divine trust or hope. In short, Love and Serve Him for the mere joy of loving and serving. This is God—realisation.

This commendable publication will fulfil the long-felt requirement of a comparative, critical, knowledgeable, carefully argued and lucid account of Shri Vallabhacharyaji's famous and inspiring message.

PRABHUDAS BALUBHAI PATWARI
Author of "*The Divine Flutist*"
Chairman Gandhi Centenary
Literature Propogation Committee

Rs 35/-

৪ আগস্ট৭০, মঙ্গলবার

BALKRISHNA BOOK Co.
Hazratganj, Lucknow.

SHRI
VALLABHACHARYA
HIS PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

Prof. Jethalal G. Shah M. A.
(Retired Principal and Professor, S.L.U. College for women, Ahmedabad and a fellow of the Senate, Syndicate, A.C. and the Board of Philosophy—S.N.D.T. Women's University, Bombay] and author of several publications on the Shuddhadvaita learning.)

FOREWORD
BY
Prof. Norvin Hein
Asst. Prof. of Comparative Religion, Yale University (U. S. A.)

PUSHTIMARGIYA PUSTAKALAYA, NADIAD.

Available from:-
PUBLISHER—R. M. Doshi, Hon. Secretary.
THE PUSHTIMARGIYA PUSTAKALAYA (Library),
NADIAD, Gujarat (India).

Works by

Prof. J. G. Shah M. A.

(23, Mahalaxmi Society, Ahmedabad. 7. Gujarat, India)

Translation with an introduction and critical and explanatory notes on Vallabhacharya's Anu-Bhashya on the Brahma Sutras in two Volumes, and of the Tattva Dipa Nibandha in two Vols. with Sanskrit text (in English). A Primer of Anu-Bhashya (English), Shuddhadvaita Martanda (English), Tamasa Fala Prakarana (Bhagavata Subodhini), Rasesha Shri Krishna., A message of the Gita, Pushti Darpana, Vasana Vishuddhi etc.

Copy right reserved by J. G. Shah.

First Edition. Copies 1500. 1969 A.D.
Price Rs. 35. $ 8. Shillings 50. Postage etc. extra.

Printed by Shantilal H. Shah at the Navajivan Press,
Ahmedabad-14 and published by the Hon. Secretary
Pushtimargiya Pustakalaya at Nadiad, Gujarat, (India).

FOREWORD

The publication of this book is a happy event in the development of international appreciation of the rich variety available in Indian thought. The mistaken idea still lingers everywhere that Indian intellectual creativity culminates and exhausts itself in impersonalistic monism and that the other Hindu outlooks are relatively feeble experiments, useful for their preparatory efficacy alone. The schools that once challenged the scholars of the *mayavada* in public debate have tended in the twentieth century to be silent, and their silence has made them seem to submit to the *advaita's* calim to be the one true Hindu orthodoxy.

In the present book, Professor Jethalal G. Shah, faithful and learned member of the theistic school of Vallabhacharya, throws aside the century-old reticence of his sect and places its teachings boldly before the world in a world language. Readers will be especially interested in Professor Shah's forthright comparisons between the Suddhadvaita teachings and those of Samkara, and his willingness to see the two outlooks as rival rather than graded apprehensions of truth. The recovery of self-confidence by this five-hundred-year-old movement reminds the world that theism, too, is a thoroughly Indian outlook, taught of old by powerful teachers who presented it as no inferior accommodated teaching. The modern tendency of Suddhadvaitins and others to assert their own special heritages without embarrassment of apology may well herald the return in India of the creativity of former ages, when streams of original thought were springing up incessantly out of the free exchange of diverse opinions.

Some sensitive persons may fear that the rejecting of *advaita's* one-sided synthesis of all doctrines in its own, will be followed by outbreaks of theological quarrelling. Such people will find reassurance here in the charitable spirit in which Professor Shah presents his faith. He describes the views of others without malice, and presents his own without imputing the least foolishness to anyone, Non-Hindu theists should be delighted and encouraged to learn in these pages that many thinkers in India also have felt that faith in the significance of human beings implies belief that Ultimate Reality, too, is in some sense a Person. The writer of this foreword, a theist who is a Christian, extends fraternal greetings and congratulations to the Hindu theists of Gujarat who in this book defend belief after belief in which Hindus and Christians agree completely and have common cause.

Those who have read Professor Shah's unique earlier work, *A Primer of Anubhashya* (Shuddhadvaita Sansad, 1960), know his capacity for meticulous textual scholarship. This new book of his adopts a different style and is being published for a different purpose. It is a popular presentation, intended to give a general overview of the doctrine of the Vallabha Sampradaya as taught today by its broadly educated modern leaders. Academic documentation is for the most part omitted, and such sources as are translated are rendered freely rather than literally. Professor Shah writes lucid idiomatic English. It is assumed that the printer's errors that make the preliminary sheets difficult to read will all be corrected in the final publication.

It is a pleasure to hail the appearance of this book and to testify to its value as an introduction to a form of Hinduism that deserves much more attention from the world.

NORVIN HEIN
Associate Professor of Comparative Religion,
The Divinity School, Yale University, America.

PUBLISHER'S NOTE

This library was established at the inspiration of Goswami Aniruddhacharyaji and with the help of Sarvashri Lallubhai Pranvallabhdas Parekh, Tribhuvandas Pitamberdas and other Vaishnavas in 1909.

The Institution is not a mere library but it undertakes numerous activities of propagation, publication and distribution of devotional literature particularly of Shuddhadvaita Vedanta School.

The Institution takes pleasure and pride for this unique publication, being the first full study of Vallabhacharya as a philosopher. There was a long felt need for a comprehensive, critical and analytical commentary on his Tenets. Vallabhacharya heralded a new era of Bhakti-Marga, which teaches unswearing love towards God admitting everyone in the fold, irrespective of sex, cast or nationality. It is regrettable that the system of Vallabhacharya has not been faithfully represented till today.

Prof. Jethalal Shah has exhibited remarkable labour of love in preparing this erudite exposition. We are confident that through this publication, there will be effective spread of the message of Shri Vallabhacharya in the Western thinking world. We hope it will stimulate and interest the Occidental world with hitherto unknown concepts and images of orietnal wisdom of a neglected but masterly genius.

We are very much thankful for the warm response given to this Institution by many lovers of Shri Vallabhcharya by rendering financial assistance. We may mention some of the names—viz. Goswami Shri Purushottamlalji (Kotah), M/s. Scindia Steam Navigation Co. (Rs. 3,000/-) through Sumatibahen, Shri Damodardas Mundada, Calcutta (Rs. 1500)- and M/s. Kishore Trading Co. Calcutta (Rs. 1500/-) through Shri R. B. Shah, Shri Basudiwala Trsut Fund (Rs. 1251/-), Shri Ravindra Maganlal (Rs. 1,001/-), Shri Gopaldas Kapadia (Rs. 1,001/-) Sheth Balabhai Girdharbhai (Rs. 1,000), Shri Muljibhai H. Shah (Rs.1000/-) and various others. Our Honorary secretary, Shri R. M. Doshi, and Sarvashri M. T. Gandhi and T. R. Shah have taken great pains in collecting funds. It will be an act of ingratitude if I forget the name of Shri Ramanlal B. Shah, the Chairman of the United Commercial Bank Limited, who showed much enthusiasm in collecting the necessary funds.

Shri Prabhudas Balubhai Patwari, the Chairman of Gandhi Centenary Literature Propagation Committee Trust deserves our thanks for his help and guidance from the beginning to the end. We also thank the Navajivan Press for nice printing and get-up.

My Collegues of the Library Committee deserve my congratulations for their enthusiastic co-operation in the publication of this work.

RANCHHODLAL MAGANLAL SHAH
President

A Note on Transliteration

Due to the press difficulty, it was not possible to adopt in this work, the scheme of using the dialectical marks of transliteration. The readers are requested to read the following words used in the work, as below:

Purusha–Puruṣa, Purushottama–Puruṣottama, Pushti–Puṣti, Krishna–Krṣṇa, Acharya–Açarya, Vallabhacharya–Vallabhāchārya, Ramanuja–Rāmānuja, Shruti–Srti, Shankaracharya–Shankarāchārya Bhaskara–Bhāskara, Shuddhadvaita–Suddhādvaita, maya–māyā, Akshara–Akṣara, Vishishtadvaita–Viśistādvaita, Upanishads–Upaniṣads,

The letter 'Sha' to be pronounced as 'Śa', 'Cha' as 'Ca' and 'Chha' as 'Ca'.

INTRODUCTION

As a writer of this work, I owe an explanation to the readers of this publication. I believe that no detailed work devoted to the teachings of philosophy and religion of Shri Vallabhacharya has hitherto been published; although there are several works on the history of the Indian philosophy by the eminent writers like Dr. S. Das Gupta, Dr. Radhakrishnan and others. Excepting the work of Dr. Dasgupta there is not much information regarding the subject dealt with here.

My aim in undertaking this project is not to give the biography of Shri Vallabhacharya but to make comprehensive attempt for the presentation, analysis, correct interpretation and evalution by comparative and critical method of Shri Vallabhacharya's Philosophy and Tenets.

Shri Vallabhacharya is one of the foremost Indian philosophers taking the rank amongst the first class thinkers who have expounded the philosophy of non-dualistic Monism. He represents a particular branch of non-dualistic Monism, characterised as a pure Non-Dualism without interference of Maya or illusion. He believes in God, endowed with divine personality and so his Monism is tantamount to monotheism as understood by the Upanishadas. He is the first exponent of this non-dualistic philosophy of monotheism, and the doctrine of Grace religiously. He earnestly believes that the basic aim of life is God-Realization and that too through grace of God. The writer's main endeavour is to put all possible material on Vallabhacharya's philosophy and religion within the reach of the scholars and general readers interested in understanding and studying it.

The readers may kindly excuse me for repetition of some ideas in the course of dicussion of different topics in different chapters. If the readers will bear in mind that repetition was necessitated by the requirements of emphasis and comparative view of the same by different thinkers; then they will be good enough to appreciate it.

I am indebted to the Pushti Margiya Pushtakalaya, Nadiad, the President, and its active bearers, even Shri R. N. Dalal and others who have undertaken the entire responsibility for the publication of this volume. My special thanks are due to Sarvashri R. M. Doshi and A. J. Shah Retired Asst. D. E. I. for rendering valuable services in various directions including the tedious task of proof-reading. Words fail me to express thanks to both these friends for their service.

Due to paucity of space, the writer very much regrets the omission of mentioning good services of some eminent personalities in the cause of renaissance of the Shuddhadvaita learning. I only make a bare reference to their names—Late Tilkayat Maharaja of Nathadwara, Goverdhanlalji, H. H. Balkrishnalalji of Kankroli, H. H. Jivanlalji of Porbandar, H. H. Gokulnathaji of Bombay and H. H. Vraj Ratnalalji of Surat. I must also refer to Sarvashri M. G. Shashtri, R. V. Patwari, L. P. Parekh, M. T. Teliwala, D. V. Sankalia, V. N. Shah, N. N. Gandhi, M. V. Gandhi, Gopaldas Jhalani, Dr. P. Katrecha, G. H. Bhatta, Ramnatha Shastri, Ratangopal Bhatta, H. O. Shastri and K. K. Shastri, Mukhia Gokuldas Sundarlal Vakil. I am indebted to Goswami Vraj Ratnalalji of Surat, an eminent Acharya, well-versed in the Shuddhadvaita learning, for the inspiration and encouragement I received from him from time to time. I am also grateful to Goswami Shri Purushotamlalji of Kotah for his keen interest and help in this publication and also Goswami Shri Krishnajivanji, Shri Dixitji and Shri Ranchhodlalji (Prathamesh) for their contribution to the course of the Shuddhadvaita learning and for their good regards for me.

For the preparation of this work my special acknowledgments are due to several oriental as well as occidental scholars whose works I have utilized in analysing some points of Shri Vallabhacharyaji's philosophy. I must mention the names of Dr. Radhakrishnan, Shri Arvinda and Prof. Joad, Dasgupta, Bhattacharya, Chandrashekhar Sharma, Bhandarkar, P. Johanns and M. C. Parikh.

It is my duty to thank Prof. Norvin J. Hein, S.J. of the Divinity School of Yale University. I am not exaggerating the fact, if I state that the impetus of undertaking this project came to me as a friendly suggestion from him, which he was kind enough to communciate to me in his personal letter. He is very much interested in the literature of the Hinduism in general and Vaishnavism in particular. As a Fulbright research scholar, he made an intensive study of the Western understading of Hinduism paying special attention to the theological interpretations and other evaluating theories, employed by the Western writers of Hinduism. He is acquainted with the general principles of the Shuddhadvaita, as discussed in the Anu Bhasya and Tattva Dip Nibandh of Vallabhacharya. I am extremely pleased in having a Foreword to the book from him.

My thanks are also due to Shri Prabhudas B. Patwari B.A., LL.B., Senior Advocate of the Supreme Court of India, for his friendly advice from time to time for the successful prosecution of this project. I also thank the Manager of Navajivan Press Dhirubhai Naik for his good help throughout the entire printing of the work.

I cannot forget the signal service of my son Dr. N. J. Shah M.A., Ph.D. and my daughter Shakuntla, M.A.,B.T. and Kundan. My blessings to them.

It is my sacred duty as an author to associate the names of my wife Narmada and my daughter Chandrakantabahen, B.A., B.T. (both deceased) with this work. It was their loving memory which gave me an urge to undertake this work. May God rest their souls in peace.

JETHALAL G. SHAH.

1-7-69
Mahalaxmi Society,
Ahmedabad-7.
(Gujarat) India

CONTENTS

Foreword iii

Publisher's Note v

A note on transliteration vi

Introduction vii

CHAPTER I : **A Bibliographical Sketch** *3–53*

His ancestors 3, Birth 4, First Pilgrimage 5, Discussion with Dhondi 6, Philosophical Disputation at the court of the King of Vijayanagar 7, Meeting with Raghavacharya 21, At Pandharpura 25, The Second Pilgrimage 29, His Sixteen Works 31, Tour to the places in Gujarat 35, Marriage 44, Third Pilgrimage 45, At senses 46, Death of Madhava Bhatta Kashmiri 49, Renunciation 49, Passing away 51.

CHAPTER II: **As a Philosopher** *54–148*

History of Indian Philosophy in a nutshell 55, Explanation of the word 'Shuddhadvaita' 57, Proofs of knowledge 58, Validity of Knowledge 62, Existence of God 68, Nature of Ultimate Reality or Supreme God 69, Purushottama as Supreme God 70, Brahman as Ananda or Bliss 73, Brahman as Determinate and Indeterminate 77, Brahman as Substratum of opposite qualities 80, Immanence and Transcendence of Brahman 81, Akshara and Purushottama 83, The Categories 84, Krishna 85, The Status of the World 88, The Samkhya System 89, The Nyaya Vaisheshika Theory of the world 94, Buddhism 96, The Mimansa School 101, Jainism 103, Mayavada, the Theory of Illusion 104, The Theory of Unmodified Change 114, The Theory of Error 116, The World of God (Jagat) and the World of ego (Samsara) 120, Souls 124, Five ways of the operation of Nescience or Avidya 129; Refutation of the Shamkarites re. the origin of souls 131, The Kinds of souls 137, God, Absolute or Personal 142.

CHAPTER III : **As a Religious Teacher** *149–229*

Principal forms of God Realisation 150, Karma 151, Action versus Knowledge 153. Knowledge 158, Devotion 164, Pushti Marga or the path of Grace of God

164, Definition of Bhakti 165, Growth of Devotion 169, Divine Service 177, Divine Grace 185, Nirodha—A special kind of mental discipline 186, Sannyasa (Renunciation) 190, Sarvatmabhava 192, Surrender 195, Concept of Krishna as Divinity 198, Krishna as Love or Bliss 202, Devotion as Rasa or a Sentiment 205. Life after death—Rebirth, Universal character of Vallabhacharya's Religion 225.

CHAPTER IV : **Vallabhacharya Compared with other Acharyas** *229–245*

Shamkaracharya 230, Ramanujacharya 233, Bhaskara 237, Madhavacharya 237, Chaitanya 237, Shri Kantha 240, Shripati 240, Vijnana Bhikshu 241, Arvinda 242.

CHAPTER V : **Vallabhacharya in the light of the Western Philosophy** 246–*263*

Knowledge 247, Truth and Error 248, God 249, The World, 253, The self-Evil Value 257.

CHAPTER VI : **Vallabhacharya as a Renovator of Social life** *264*

CHAPTER VII : **Mysticism** *295*

CHAPTER VIII: **Philosophy of Divine Life and Divine Love** *312*

CHAPTER IX : **Aestheticism** *329*

CHAPTER X : **Contributors to Shuddhadvaita Philosophy** *342*

CHAPTER XI : **Appreciation** *349*

SECTION II

1. A Synoptical Survey of the literature of the Shudhadvaita School. *377–479*

2. (a) Appendix I *481*
   (b) Appendix II *484*
   (c) Appendix III *488*
   (d) Appendix IV *492*
   (e) Appendix V *494*
   (f) Appendix VI *495*
   (g) Errata *498*



Shrimad Vallabhacharya
A. D. 1479-1531

VALLABHACHARYA - HIS PHILOSOPHY
AND
RELIGION

(Chapters I to XI)

"Let us meditate upon Supreme Truth (God) which dispels darkness of ignorance by His own self-effulgent glory."

The Bhagavata I-1--1

CHAPTER I

SHRI VALLABHACHARYA, (1479-1531 AD)

"He who surpasses others in glory, brilliancy or power is the manifestation of God's effulgence"

Bhagvad Gita. 8-41

A short biographical sketch of Vallabhacharya will be necessary as preliminary to the elucidation of his Philosophy and Religion. As this book is mainly concerned with his contribution to the Hindu Philosophy and Religion, we shall dwell only on those particulars in his life, that have a bearing on his scholarship and genius as a philsopher and religious teacher. He was the founder of the Shuddhadvaita School of Indian Philosophy (School of Pure Non-dualism) and of the religious sect called Pushti Marga (The Path of Grace). The observations and findings contained in this book are based not only on the original works of Vallabhacharya but also on those of his descendents who were themselves thinkers as well as commentators on Vallabhacharya's Philosophy.

Vallabhacharya was the second son of Lakshmana Bhatt, a Tailangana Brahmin. His ancestors were men of deep learning steeped in Vedic lore and the Hindu scriptures. They lived in Kakarvad or Kakumbhakar, a town on the southern bank of the river Krishna, in the vicinity of Mount Vyomasthambha, in what is presently known as the Andhra State. Their family name was Vellanadu. One of his ancestors, Yagnanaryana Bhatta was a great devotee of the Vaishnava faith. Another ancestor, Ganapati Bhatta, was the author of a book called Sarva Tarka (Nigrahai). The latter's son, Balbhadra, wrote several books on Hindu Religion pertaining specially to the cult of devotion. Ballabhadra had two sons, Lakshamana and Janardana. Lakshamana married Yallamagaru, the daughter of a priest named Susharma who was in the service of the royal family of Vijayanagar. It is said that after the birth of a son and two daughters, Lakhsmana Bhatt decided to renounce the world and that a sage persuaded him, not to do so but to continue the life of a householder. However, he spent most of his time in devotion to Lord Gopala (a form of God). He made pilgrimages to holy places and later settled at Varanasi (Benares). Here he lived for some time, but later, fearing disturbance and violence owing to Muslim domination in North India, he fled with his family by a certain route which took him to Southern India. On his way to the South, he halted at Champaranya, where Shri Vallabhacharya was born. There are two views regarding the year of his birth. One view is based on facts recorded in the majority of later works, according to which it is 1479 A.D. (Samvat 1535). The other view which is held by the followers of ·Gokulnatha, believes his birth date to be 1473 A.D. (Samvat 1529). It is unnecessary to enter into this controversy here. The commonly accepted view is in favour of 1473 A. D. An anecdote in Nijavarta (a work highlighting some incidents in Vallabhacharya's life) records that his birth did not occur in the normal course of events. While Lakshamana Bhatta fled from Varanasi, Yallamagaru was big with child. The terror and physical strain of the flight suffered by Yallamagaru resulted in the birth of the child at Champaranya, two months prematurely. Taking the child to be still-born, for it showed no signs of life at first, the parents sadly placed it under a tree wrapped in a piece of cloth and retreated to the nearest village. The next day they received the astonishingly happy news that the child was alive. It is also believed that God appeared in a dream, before the parents of Vallabhacharya and signified that He had taken his birth as the child which they had abandoned as dead, and which was in fact not dead but living. Accordingly they repaired immediately to the spot and to their great consternation mixed with joy, they found the divine babe enveloped by fire as its protecting spirit. The blessed Mother extended her arms into the fire unscathed and received from fire the divine babe, gleefully to her bosom. The child was named Vallabha since he was (naturally) very dear to his parents. Later he was known as Vallabhacharya. Great persons are believed to have been born under extraordinary circumstances and so was the birth of Vallabhacharya. The parents stayed at Champaranya for some days before they returned to Varanasi when normal conditions had once more prevailed.

Lakshamana Bhatta himself was a learned man, and so he took keen interest in the education of his son. He engaged the best tutors who were well versed in their subjects. Care was taken to impart Vallabhacharya's education in Sanskrit. The Boy's education commenced at the age of seven with the study of the four Vedas. Each Veda was taught under a different specialist. Before he was in his teens he acquired mastery, not only over the books expounding the six systems of Indian philosophy but also on the philosophical systems of Shankara, Ramanuja Madhva, Nimbarka and the Buddhistic as well as the Jain Schools. His range of study extended over a vast field of Sanskrit learning. Since boyhood he evinced keen interest in Religion and Philosophy. It is stated that his engrossment in the Bhagavata which describes the Lilas or sports of Lord Krishna made him neglect his other studies but it is not true although it is a fact that the Rasa-Lila portion of the Bhagavata particularly appealed to him. Lakshmana Bhatta's house was adorned with wall-paintings illustrating the Lilas described in Book X of the Bhagavata. The Rasa-Lila was also represented in the wall-paintings. Often he would sit there-his mind fully engrossed in the paintings, oblivious to the daily routine of life. This fact though trivial in itself, predicts his destiny as a lover and propagator of the Bhagavata-Dharma. His parents entertained high hopes of his future greatness as a leading religious teacher and founder of a new system of Indian philosophy. Unfortunately, his father passed away before long, leaving him, at the age of eleven, to the care of his mother. Soon after his father's demise, moved by a pious urge, he undertook three pilgrimages all over India to various holy places, in order to spread his message with missionary zeal and to augment his knowledge and experience.

His first choice for a pilgrimage, at this tender age, was for South India, for the North was in a politically and communally disturbed State owing to Muslim domination. There were other reasons for this choice as we shall presently see. South India was the land of the birth of great Acharyas like Shankara, Ramanuja, Bhaskara, Nimbarka and Madhva. It had many seats where scholars from different parts of India met for discussions and debates on philosophical and religious subjects. It was free from political disturbance, and, it was the centre of Vaishnavism. A large part of south India was ruled by the Hindu Kings of Vijayanagar.

About fifteen years of his life were spent in pilgrimages. He travelled on foot with a few followers. He made brief halts at various places and delivered lectures on the Bhagavata and other subjects. By his learning and power of speech he could make great impression on his audience. The learned circles respected him as Bala Saraswati. Warm reception was accorded to him wherever he went. Those who came to scoff and to dispute with him, became his true followers.

His First Pilgrimage:

The party first proceeded to Chitrakuta and then moved to Champaranya where he gave discourses on the Bhagavata. Then he directed his course to Siddhipada Vriddhunagar and Stambhadipura and finally reached Agrabiara where the sacred thread ceremony of his younger brother Keshava was performed. Next, he visited Mangalaprastha where he had a discussion with one, Dhondhi who maintained that sacrificial cult was the only means of liberation. Dhondhi anxious to hear Vallabhacharya's views on this subject had a discussion with him as follows:

Dhondhi: "Do you believe in the Vedas, the Gita and Purva-Mimansa?"

Vallabhacharya: "Yes."

Dhondhi: "Then why do you preach Devotion and not Sacrifice as a means of religious life. Do you not agree that sacrifice is also taught by the Vedas, the Gita and the Purva-Mimansa?"

Vallabhacharya: "Yes. These scriptures do teach sacrifice. I too, accept sacrifice as one of the means of God-realisation. There is no question of rejecting it. But as a means of religious life sacrifice is not as important as knowledge and devotion. It is important to know that it is only the Purva Kanda of the Vedas that teaches sacrifice while the latter part of the Vedas stresses knowledge exclusively. Also Sacrifice is depricated in the Shrutis, where it is compared with a frail boat which proves useless in crossing the ocean of mundane life. The Purva-Mimansa teaches only sacrifice-to the exclusion of knowledge and in this way fails to do full justice to the truth of the Vedas. The Gita no doubt supports sacrifice but it mentions other means also such as Knowledge, Worship, Devotion and Mind-control. It is condemned in the Gita, (Chapter II verses 42-43) if it is performed with the hope of obtaining heavenly bliss. It does not guarantee eternal bliss. In the Gita chapter IV, verse 37, knowledge is regarded as superior to work (sacrifice). The Gita no doubt mentions all the means, such as work (sacrifice), knowledge and mental discipline, but in chapter VI verses 46-47 and in subsequent verses it recommends devotion as the supreme means. It is for this reason that we lay emphasis on devotion. However, we do not totally reject the cult of sacrifice. We recognize its usefulness for self-purification which is indispensable to the seeker of God. But since the way of sacrifice (Karma Kanda) has for its goal heavenly bliss, we shun it. Our goal is only God-realisation through knowledge etc. Again the sacrificial cult has degenerated into the slaughtering of animals. You must know that the killing of animals (Himsa) is a great sin against God."

On hearing this, Dhondhi could argue no further but bowed reverentially and departed.

Continuing his journey, he reached Kundinpura, where a distinguished scholar sought an interview with him for a debate on the reflection—theory of Shankara. After a preliminary exposition by the scholar of his view, he had the following discussion with him.

Vallabhacharya: "The theory of Shankara, has no support in the Upanishads, the Gita, the Brahma-Sutras of the Bhagavata. It is simply a myth of Shankara and I believe he alone is responsible for the idea. Please tell me —What is the nature of Brahman?"

The Scholar: "Brahman is Nirakara (formless)."

Vallabhacharya: "Well what do you think of Maya in which Brahman is reflected as in a mirror? Is it clean or unclean?"

The Scholar: "Unclean."

Vallabhacharya: "Has Maya a beginning?"

The Scholar: "No."

Vallabhacharya: "Now listen, you are caught in the net of your own argument. Tell me, can a thing which is formless be reflected, in a mirror?"

The Scholar: "No."

Vallabhacharya: "Listen to my rebuttal of the reflection theory. Firstly I ask you, how can Brahman who is formless be reflected in Maya?"

Secondly, you know that for a reflection of any object the mirror must be clean but your Maya is unclean. Thirdly, if as you say, Maya is a screen enveloping Brahman, how can any object, veiled or unveiled by a screen produce a reflection?

To me your views seem to be illogical."

On hearing this ingenious reply, the opponent who had tested Vallabhacharya's learning was overwhelmed with admiration for him. It struck him that he would make a mark as an original thinker and a founder of a new philosophical school. He took his leave with a reverential bow.

Subsequently, Vallabhacharya proceeded to Kalasri where he was involved in a philosophical discussion on the Khyativada (The Doctrine of Error) with some scholars who desired to ascertain his view on that subject. Vallabhacharya explained various kinds of Khyatis, resorted to by the Buddhists and the followers of Samkhya, the Naiyayika, the Vaisheshika and the Mimansa schools.

He repadiated the explanations given by the schools just referred to. According to him, a misconception does not deny the existence of the reality of the "objects" involved. For example, a rope may be mistaken for a snake. This does not negate the reality of the two objects. It is the obscuration of the Sattva quality of the intellect that projects a different image. A misconception does not challenge the ultimate reality of the world. Thus the world which is Brahman is wrongly considered to have no ultimate reality. The fact is that the world is only the SAT* aspect of Brahman and as such it is real. The world is falsely imagined as having a separate existence. The Scholar was perfectly satisfied with this explanation.

Vallabhacharya's next stopping points were Vyankateshwara and Lakshmana Balaji. Here, one Ravinatha tested his learning in the Vedas particularly in his knowledge of the Vedic Mantras. Vallabhacharya correctly recited hundred mantras, not only from beginning to end but also in the reverse order. Then he was questioned about the true nature of Tamas (darkness). Vallabhacharya explained Tamas as a negative quality, that is to say, absence of light, not as a positive quality as conceived by the Vaisheshika school. It was particularly in this town that he made a strong impression on the public as an embodiment of knowledge. He was now applauded as a Bala Saraswati.

At Lakshmana Balaji, news came to him about a sensational debate being conducted`at Vijayanagar between the Vaishnavites of Madhva and the Shankarites, over the philosophical question whether God is Dualistic or non-dualistic. The controversy had been dragging on for several days, with successful wavering between the two parties. Hearing, that the Mayavadins, at a certain stage, were scoring a victory over their opponents, Vallabhcharya determined to participate in the discussion with a view to turning the scales in favour of Vaishnavaism believing that the victory of the Mayavidins would deal a fatal blow to Vaishnavism in the South. He felt that it was not only his duty but also a divine call to uphold the Madhva cause at Vijayanagar.

Vijayanagar was at this time the most important Hindu Kingdom in India. It was like a small empire in the South with its sovereignty over many states. The city of Vijayanagar itself, built on the bank of the river Tungabhadra, had a circumference of nearly sixty miles. Its might and power matched its size. It attracted people from all parts of India for its fine palaces, roads and temples, of which there were about four thousand. It was like a strong hold of Vaishnavism. When Vallabhacharya visited it, it was ruled by King Narasimha, but Krishnadevaraya was the virtual ruler. He and his wife were devout Vaishnavites, followers of Madhva. Although the royal family followed Vaishnavism, they still maintained a policy of catholic toleration toward other sects. The rulers of Vijayanagar were all esteemed as champions of Hinduism.

---

* Sat, Chit, and Ananda are the three aspects of Brahman's manifestations. Sat implies existence as such, Chit life, force and Ananda bliss.

Vallabhacharya informed his maternal uncle who held a high position of the king's priest at Vijayanagar about his visit to that place. His uncle secured permission from the ruler to allow Vallabhacharya to participate in the discussion. The ruler was not particularly interested in enquiring into Vallabhacharya's learning. Vyas-Tirtha who presided over the discussions and other learned Pandits escorted Vallabhacharya to the conference-hall. At the commencement of the sessions, Krishnadeva introduced him to the assembly, saying, "Here is a new participant in the discussion, by our permission. Though young in years he is old in wisdom and well versed in all the branches of learning, so as to deserve the well earned epithet of Bala-Saraswati, from all Scholars. I am sure you will give him the opportunity of discussing the question which is before the assembly." Vallabhacharya then stood up and enquired from the President of the Conference, the points to be discussed. Vyasa-Tirtha informed him that the controversial points to be discussed and decided mainly related to the nature of Reality (Brahman), the relationship of the soul, and the world to Brahman (God) and the doctrine of Maya (illusion). He then briefly summarised the view-points of both the sides. Actually it had been a cause of conflict between the Dualistic school of Madhva and the Non-dualistic school of Shankara. Vallabhacharya was a non-dualist but his non-dualism was quite different from that of Shankara. Hence Vallabhacharya had no direct concern with the issue except as a representative of the Madhva school of Vaishnavism and as a God—inspired supporter of the Bhagavata. Vallabhacharya observed the whole situation and started to introduce his point of view when Vidya-Tirtha interrupted him, seeking clarification of the scriptural basis or authority of his arguments. Vallabhacharya replied, "I rely on the Vedas, the Gita, the Brahma-Sutras and the Bhagavata as authorities concerning the knowledge of God." To this Vidya-Tirtha objected and queried him, "When the Vedas and the Brahma-Sutra are sufficient, why do you take the Bhagavata also as an authority? We do not accept it." Vallabhacharya retorted, "You may not accept it but I do. The Bhagavata does not say anything which is not taught in the first three scriptures. Besides, it clarifies certain obscure matters of the Vedas and the Gita: The authority of the Puranas is accepted by the Upanishads also. The Brihadaranyaka Upanishad mentions that the Puranas like the Vedas are the breath of God. The Chhandogya Upanishad regards it as the Fifth Veda. We Vaishnavas regard devotion as a means of God-realisation. The Puranas and particularly the Bhagavata give a predominant place to devotion. The author of the Bhagavat calls the Gayatri the seed and the Vedas a tree but the Bhagavata is considered as its fruit. The Bhagavata, is, as it were, a running commentary on the truths of the Vedas. It is for this reason that I include the Bhagavata in the list of scriptural authorities.

Vidya Tirtha again querried: What proofs of knowledge do you accept?

Vallabhacharya replied: "Well, hear me please. I know there are different opinions regarding the proofs of knowledge. The Nyaya, and the Vaisheshika schools accept only four proofs-Perception, Inference, Analogy and Verbal testimony. The Mimansa school adds two more—Implication and Negation. These proofs are useful as far as knowledge of the objects of this world are concerned but for the knowledge of God, they are useless. I do not accept even the verbal testimony of human beings because it leads to misapprehension and contradictions. Besides, the verbal testimonies of men differ from one another and one is at a loss to decide as to whose testimony to accept. Therefore, I accept the verbal testimony of the scriptures only for the knowledge of God, and they are four i.e. the Vedas, the Gita, the Brahma-Sutras and the Bhagavata. Other sacred books supporting them are also acceptable to me. My point is that our arguments must be based on the above scriptures only. If you do not accept these authorities, then I have no mind to proceed in this matter."

When he ended his speech with the last words there was absolute silence in the assembly hall. Every one in the assembly admired the boldness of his manner in putting his case before the Assembly.

After a brief pause, he resumed, "I am sure you have accepted my conditions. Now I shall take up the first point which is one of the main issues regarding the nature of Brahman. I would like to know the view point of the Madhva School on this."

The leader of the Madhva school then got up and briefly stated his view accordingly. "The Madhva School believes in God, soul and matter as eternal and real but it considers God alone as independent. He is the creator, preserver and destroyer of the universe. He is transcendental as well as imminent—as the inner ruler of the soul. He is a perfect personality. He is pleased only by devotion. Souls are many and atomic. They are different from God. God is not a material cause but an efficient cause. The soul cannot be identical with God even in liberation. We believe in dualism." With these words he took his seat.

Vidya-Tirtha, being asked presented his view. He arose and said, "The Shankarite School believes in the Non-dualism of Brahman. Brahman is formless and destitute of qualities. Absolute Brahman does not create the world but Brahman under the impact of Maya creates it. Creation is not real but only apparent. Souls are not many or essentially different from one another. There is only one soul which is Absolute Brahman but due to our Avidya (Ignorance) Brahman appears as many. As a matter of fact there are no distinctions between the world, the soul and Brahman. Their appearance as the world and the soul are only phenomenal.

"The way to realise ultimate Brahman is by knowledge. Ignorance (Avidya) is the cause of bondage but knowledge is the means of release from it. In the liberated state the soul becomes identical with Brahman. To state briefly, our position is that there is one ultimate principle which is non-dual in its absolute character. The apparent differences between world, soul and Brahman are due to Maya (illusion). We believe in Indeterminate Brahman."

Having thus heard both sides, Vallabhacharya stood up to express his views and all who were present listened to him with rapt attention.

"I have heard the arguments from both the sides. The fundamental issue to be resolved is whether the Upanishads teach Dualism or Non-dualism. Well, I shall discuss this question, basing my views on the authority of the four scriptures namely, the Vedas, the Gita, the Brahma Sutras and the Bhagavata. I shall not resort to any other proof.

"Of course, Brahman is one but my study of the scriptures convinces me that Brahman is not only qualityless or formless, but also has both. We come across two kinds of descriptions in the different passages of the Upanishads—one relating to the quality-less and the other to the qualified,-Brahman. We take the qualified one to be personal. The passages referring to Brahman as quality-less deny absolutely the qualities, attributed to Brahman in other passages. We are, therefore, faced with a puzzling question as to which of the passages should be taken as the truth. If we accept any of these views, then, we accept only one half of the truth but not the whole truth. This will further lead us to the supposition that the Vedas are self-contradcitory. But to entertain such an opinion is not correct. The Vedas, being the breath of God cannot be self-contradictory. Brahman, is divine and formless. He is bodyless and yet dwells in the bodies. He is without vital breath and mind. He is free from attachment. He is neither internal nor external. He is neither being nor non-being. This describes Brahman as indeterminate and quality-less. On the other hand, Chapter I, Verse I of the Mandukya Upanishad refers to Brahman as omniscient. Katha Upanishad (2-5-12) says that Brahman is a controller of all beings." Brahman is one, but assumes many forms. Taitiriya Upanishad (2-1) describes Brahman as embodiment of truth, knowledge and bliss. The Brihadaranyaka Upanishad (1-5-15) regards Brahman as possessing hands, feet, eyes, ears and heads turned in all directions. This means that the Vedas dscribe one Brahman but in two aspects. One aspect is the positive, determinate or qualified and the other is the negative, indeterminate or quality-less aspect. They represent Brahman from both points of view. We must not suppose that the Vedas teach two Brahmans. There is no difference between the Absolute (Impersonal) and Maya conditioned (Personal), Brahman described in the Vedas, as supposed by Shankaracharya.

"It is not correct to say that Absolute Brahman alone is the supreme reality and that the personal or qualified Brahman is secondary. If we accept this erroneous view, then we must reject the Shruti which emphatically declares that Brahman is the only one without dualism. If this is not the meaning then why should the Shruti have added the words "only" and "without dualism"? The basic truth according to the Upanishads is that Brahman is one even though He is the creator of the Universe and is possessed of qualities.

"Those who argue in favour of the quality-less Brahman do not seem to realise that even to describe such a Brahman they have to use terms like inaccessible, bodiless etc. Do not these terms imply the qualities of Brahman in a negative way? Brahman is so great that He is beyond description or comprehension. The author of the Brahma-Sutras has considered the question in Book III, chapter 2 and has reconciled the two views in the aphorism -III-2-22 by stating that Brahman is both determinate and indeterminate. The indeterminate denies earthly qualities and the determinate affirms that Brahman possesses divine qualities. This means that Brahman is not destitute of qualities which are beyond comprehension and divine. This is the right interpretation, otherwise how can the Shruti declare that Brahman, though without hands and feet is 'a runner and holder of things'? If Brahman has no hands, how can He hold anything? And if He has no feet, how can He run? The acts of holding and running presuppose the existence of hands and feet. We cannot see His hands and feet because they are divine. Brahman is not formless. His form consists of Bliss (Ananda) which is His essence just as sweetness is the essence of a thing made only of sugar. Similarly, Brahman's bliss is everywhere. In this sense, Brahman is personal. The qualities or attributes of Brahman are manifested in all things. Each thing is expressive of a particular quality of Brahman. There is nothing that does not reveal Brahman's quality. The etymological meaning of the word 'Guna' (Quality) is: 'a thread by which things are bound. Matter or nature consists of three Gunas, *Sattva*, *Rajas* and *Tamas*,' which have an impact on the soul during worldly existence. But Brahman is not influenced by them at all. So Brahman is conceived as "Nirguna" or quality-less.

"Brahman is conceived in the Upanishads both positively and negatively. According to the Gita Brahman is determinate and indeterminate. The Mayavadins' concept of Brahman seems to be incorrect. It is contrary to the Upanishads.

"According to the Shankarite view, Brahman is indeterminate, but He appears as determinate due to Maya (Illusion). Let us examine this view. The Maya theory has no basis. I have read all the Upanishads but I have not come across the word '*Maya*' in the sense of illusion except in the Shvetashvatara Upanishad. The Maya-theory is not supported by the Upanishads. The Gita uses it in the sense of Brahman's power. The Brahman-Sutras have used it only once in Book III, Chapter 2 with reference to the dream-phenomena, which are false. The Bhagavata Purana refers to it, only to bring home to us that our attachment to worldly life is the cause of bondage in this world and to teach that the goal of God-realisation requires detachment from worldly attractions. Maya is the power of God. It is dependent on God (Brahman). It is only an instrument in the creative activity of God. It obeys God's Will in the manifestation of various forms of creation which are not illusory. If Shankara's theory is accepted, then Maya will have to be regarded as the Controller of Brahman. In that case, Maya will be the Supreme Principle and not Brahman. That is a false position which will be unacceptaple even to Shanakara. Maya has no locus. Brahman cannot be its locus because the nature of Brahman is opposed to that of Maya. You cannot say that Maya or ignorance conceals the nature of Brahman. If it is so, then Brahman cannot be considered self-conscious or self-luminous. Is Brahman positive or negative? I do not think the Mayavadins can give a categorical answer to that question. To describe Brahman as indescribable is itself contradictory. The very word 'indescribable, itself qualifies It. Brahman is beyond any proofs—perception, inference or verbal testimony (scriptures). It is argued by the Mayavadins that by the knowledge of the attributeless Brahman, ignorance is dispelled. This is incorrect. There can be no knowledge of an attributeless thing. If the Mayavadins consider Maya as a positive thing, then I maintain that ignorance which has positive existence cannot be removed. Shri Ramanujacharya also rejects the Maya-theory of Shankaracharya. Bhaskara with a view to examining this theory has advanced many arguments against it. It seems to me that Shankaracharya conceived the Maya-theory under the influence of Gaudapadacharya whose sympathy lay with Buddhism. Finding apparent contradictions in the Upanishads concerning the nature of Brahman both as determinate and indeterminate, Shankaracharya utilised the Maya-theory to support his view.

"Now regarding Brahman's causality, I would invite your particular attention to the opening part of the Brahma-Sutras. The aphorism in Book I Chapter 2, Verse I, says that Brahman is the cause of the world. In Book I, chapter 2 and verse 3, Brahman is said to be the material cause and in Book I, Chapter 2 and verses 4 to 10. It is known as the efficient cause of the world. In Book II, the position of the Samkhya, the Nyaya, Vaisheshika, the Buddhistic and the Jain schools, is considered and the author of the Brahma-Sutras finds their view unacceptable. The universe is the manifestation of the 'being' aspect of Brahman. It is an aspect of His Sport or Lila, the result of His will.

"The Brahma-Sutras do not attribute the creation of the world to Maya-conditioned Brahman. The material and efficient cause of Its 'being' is not due to Maya. Brahman is not illusory, but real.

"Taittiriya Upanishad 3-1, Brihadaranyaka Upanishad 2-7-4-5, 2-4-6, Chhandogya Upanishad 25-2, 6-2-1, 6-1-4, Aitireya Upanishad 1-1-1, 2, Prashna Upanishad 6-3 all these support the view that, Brahman is both a material and efficient cause. The Gita, Chapters VII and VIII throw further light on this point.

"Now I come to the question regarding the relationship of the universe and the soul to Brahman. I consider the universe as real and as a part of Brahman's 'being', possessing Its essence. It had its existence in Brahman before creation and it will ultimately return to it. In all conditions casual or eternal it has existence and therefore it is real. It is not different from Brahman. It is of God and belongs to Him. I differ from the Mayavadins who consider the world as an illusion. I differ, also, from the Madhva School which maintains that the universe and the souls are different entities from Brahman. The universe and the soul are Brahman's manifestations .and so, they are essentially one with Him. The universe represents the 'being' aspect of Brahman and the soul, His consciousness aspect. The universe and the soul are not His attributes but parts. Their relation to Him is that of a part to the whole. On the one hand, I support Non-dualism but not that of the Mayavadins. On the other hand, although I reject the dualism of the Madhva School, I agree with its rejection of the Maya-theory. That is all I have to say about this controversial matter. Now it is for the arbitrator to decide whether my views are correct or not."

When he concluded his discourse, Vyas-Tirtha requested him to clarify his conception of Advaita.

Vallabhacharya replied, "I accept Advaita (Non-dualism) but not that of Shankaracharya: because he considers the universe and the soul as unreal, due to Maya. I consider them as real and as the pure essence of God. Shankaracharya believes only in Absolute Brahman. His philosophy is known as Kevala-Advaita. Mine is Shuddha-advaita. My non-dualism is pure and unmixed with the Maya conception. I recognize no difference between absolute Brahman and relative Brahman. To me Brahman is one in both the aspects. Everything is Brahman and Brahman is everywhere. My Shuddha-advaita is nothing but Brahma-Vada in its pure form. It differs from Ramanuja's Vishist-advaita; because Ramanuja considers the universe and the soul as Brahman's qualities, whereas I consider them as part and parcel of Brahman, representing His 'being' and 'consciousness.' Madhva is a dualist. He accepts Brahman as a creator, but he considers the universe and the soul as different from Brahman. Bhaskara and Nimbarka are partly dualists and partly non-dualists. I consider the Shuddha-advaita school as holding the correct view of the nature of Brahman in consonance with the Upanishads, the Gita and the Brahma-Sutras. The Vaishnavaites expound the nature of Brahman better than the Mayavadins whose views have distorted the Shrutis in order to popularise their own theory. Brahman is as one, the material and efficient cause of the universe He can be realised not by knowledge but by devotion. I fully endorse the Madhva school's stand in holding up Devotion as the supreme means for Godrealisation."

Thus having ended his speech, Vallabhacharya resumed his seat with applause from the audience. He was offered a seat of honour between Vyasa-Tirtha and Krishnadeva who were moved with admiration for his profound erudition, power of expression, clarity of thought, lucidity of language, graceful deportment, and-mental calm. As a mark of his appreciation the king stood up and bowed to him. Even the Mayavadins admired his speech. The king then, in concurrence with the verdict of the arbitrators declared victory in favour of the Vaishnava school of Madhva amidst great rejoicing, after which the gathering dispersed. Everyone praised God on account of the participation of Vallabhacharya in the controversy. They regarded him as a God-sent missionary whose timely advent saved the Vaishnava school from defeat.

That day of victory for the Vaishnavas was celebrated with great pomp and eclat in Vijayanagar. Vyasa Tirtha and Madhavendra Yati who were the leaders of the Vaishnava movement at that time requested the King to pass orders for the celebration of that day as Kanakabhishaka in honour of Vallabhacharya. the hero of that occasion. Accordingly, the king issued necessary orders to his ministers. Invitations to attend the ceremony were extended to all the officers of the State, important citizens, heads of temples, shrines and hermitages within his empire and to scholars of all the sects. A large crowd assembled before the Court to witness the ceremony. Vallabhacharya accompanied by a few of his followers, was received at the court-hall by the King, when all stood up as a mark of respect. Then, Vyasa Tirtha proclaimed the King's object in honouring Vallabhacharya by the Kanakabhisheka ceremony by anointing him with water from vessels of gold weighing a hundred maunds and by conferment on him the title of "Acharya." The king made a short speech eulogising Vallabhacharya's greatness after which the annointing ceremony was gone through, preceded by a holy bath with the same waters stored in gold vessels. Then a 'tilaka' (mark) of saffron was applied on his forehead by the king. This was followed by a deluge of garlands from the Royal family, citizens and religious heads. The king declared that he was pleased to confer on him the title of Acharya which is the title of honour for a religious head. The king, also, presented him with gold ornaments and other articles used in the ceremony besides money but Vallabhacharya declined to accept them politely. They were distributed among the poor Brahmins and the learned.

The historical authenticity of the event is borne out by contemporary works of Vallabhacharyan and other sects. Vyasa-Tirtha's biographer. Somadatta has also recorded this event. The only controversial question is whether Vallabhacharya was really in his teens at the time of this event. However, this was a turning point in Vallabhacharya's career with his earning of reputation as the greatest thinker, scholar and religious leader of his time. For him, it was the grace of God which urged him from within to spread the doctrine of love as a means of God realisation, for the aspirants of religious life. He stayed at Vijayanagar for about a year, during which period he gave daily discourses on the Bhagavata and explained the doctrine of devotion. The members of the Royal family including the king and queen, the officers and the religious-minded citizens attended his discourses in large numbers. The members of the Royal family became his followers. Vyasa Tirtha requested him to assume responsibility as the head of the Madhava sect but he declined the offer humbly, pleading that he had still to acquire more knowledge and experience which necessitated his visits to other places of religious importance.

After leaving Vijayanagar, Vallabhacharya visited Pampa Sarovara, a place associated with Rama, who during his exile, stayed there and did an act of grace namely that of eating the berries offered to him by Shabari, an aboriginal woman, who offered them after testing their ripeness. The woman was of low caste and race, whereas Rama was a high born Aryan, a Kshatriya. But Rama, moved by the piety of the woman, accepted her berries. Vallabhacharya regarded the place as associated with the Grace of Rama, an incarnation of Vishnu, which gave a unique place to love and devotion in the eyes of God. Vallabhacharya explained the significance of this episode to those who came to pay him their respects.

From Pampa Sarovara he proceeded to Mount Rishya-Muka which is a holy place for the devotees of Rama. Here one Ramadasa and some of his followers had a discussion with him. Vallabhacharya explained to them the doctrine of devotion and the significance of Grace with illustrations from the life of Valmiki. Valmiki in early life was a robber who later became a saint and poet. His transformation into a saint was an act of Divine Grace. Rumadasa who came to disputs became his admirer. Vallabhacharya next visited Kumarpada which has a shrine of Kartikaya swami. There, he had a discussion with the Pandits on the interpretation of the Brahma-Sutras regarding Kartikeya and Brahman. The Pandits were astonished at his learning. During his stay, there came a Yogin called Kapalika, who boasted of his Yogic powers which could stop the motions of the sun and the moon. Vallabhacharya replied, "You say, you can stop the motions of the heavenly bodies. I can believe you if you can only rise from your seat. That will be a proof enough for me." Hearing this Kapalika attempted to rise but failed, inspite of repeated attempts. Suspecting magical powers in Vallabhacharya and repenting his boastful attitude he requested the Acharya to take back his magical power. To this Vallabhacharya replied, "I am not aware of any magical powers in me. I have got only one power and that is the name of God. It is quite enough to work wonders by it. I can check all mischievous and evil powers by the use of His name. You should henceforth give up your boast of possessing miraculous powers. Believe only in the power of God and remember, that the use of God's power is not for securing selfish ends but for blessing the poor and the distressed. Promise me that you will not henceforth demonstrate your so-called power to others and then only you will be able to rise from your seat." Kapalika gave him a promise and rose from his seat.

After leaving that place, Vallabhacharya stopped at Shri-Shaila Tirapati, Vyankatesha, Laxmana-Balaji, Prema-Madhuri and Shiva-Kanchi before he reached Vishnu-Kanchi which place was famous for its shrine containing the idol of Lord Varadeshvara. The head-in-charge of the Shrine sent Vallabhacharya an invitation to have Darshana (sight) of the Lord. Although Vallabhacharya was eager to have the Darshana still there was one difficulty involved for him. The stone-steps leading towards the Porch of the Shrine, were inscribed with words from the 'Ashtapadi' of Jayadeva's work in praise of God. Vallabhacharya considered it a sacrilege to put his feet on the sacred inscription. The difficulty was conveyed to the head, who, after consultation with others, got the steps temporarily removed by his men, thus enabling Vallabhacharya to have a Darshana of the Lord Chakravarti, Narasinhacharya and Nilakanthacharya who were the followers of Ramanujacharya requested him to explain the nature of Brahman. He replied, "Ramanujacharya's non-dualistic conception of Brahman is more acceptable to me than Shankaracharya's but I differ from the former regardin the relation of the universe and the soul to Brahman. Ramanuja regards them as inseparable attributes of Brahman, whereas I regard them as parts or Anshas of Him. The relation between them and Brahman is that of the part to the whole. Srishti (creation) is a part of Brahman itself. Brahman is described in the Upanishads as *Sat, Chit* and *Anand* (Being, Consciousness and Bliss). The soul is according to the Gita chapter XV, verse 7 an Ansha of Brahman. The Brahma Sutras-Book II,-3,-33 also holds that the souls are portions of Brahman, like sparks from fire, as illustrated by the Shrutis. Thus the universe and the soul are not qualities but parts of Brahman. If they were Brahman's qualities, then they must have a separate existence but the Shrutis have declared in so many passages that Brahman is devoid of differences such as *Svagata* (inherent differences), *Sajatiya* (differences due to similarity) and *Vijatiya* (difference due to dissimilarity). The differences are indicated only by qualities. As Brahman is devoid of qualities, they cannot constitute Brahman's nature. *Sat* and *Chit* are not qualities but parts of Brahman. So I have to differ from the Vishist-advaita of Ramanuja. Except this fundamental point, I agree with Ramanujacharya in other matters. His view of the world as real has my firm support. To me everything is Brahman. This is what I learn from the Upanishads."

Narasinhacharya and Nilakanthacharya listened to him with utmost reverence and thanked him for the light he threw on the nature of Brahman.

After leaving Vishnukanchi, Vallabhacharya proceeded in the direction of Shri Rangaji, passing on the way, Pakshi Tirtham, Chidambaram and Mannar Gudi (the Dwarka of the South). At Shri Rangaji he was confronted by one Raghavacharya, an adherent of the Dvaita-advaita school which taught both dualism and non-dualism. The question put to Vallabhacharya was this, "How can you support Non-dualism *only* if the Upanishads point to both Dualism and Non-dualism? Don't you know that the Universe, as matter, is different from Brahman who is Consciousness and Bliss. As souls do not possess bliss they are different from God. Hence your theory that every thing is Brahman, does not appeal to us". To this Vallabhacharya replied, "Well, what you say is not in consonance with the scriptures. Your arguments are based only on logical reasoning. But they are efective. A thing cannot be both but only one or the other, where two opposites are concerned. Brahman cannot be dual and non-dual at the same time. Either you admit that dualism is correct and non-dualism is incorrect or vice versa.

"The stand taken by you and the exponents of the Dvaita-advaita has no solid foundation. The apparent differences between Brahman and creation are due to His own will to manifest Himself as the universe and the soul were one with Brahman even before their manifestation as indeed they are now. The Brihadarnyaka (2-4-5) says, 'All this is Brahman'. The same Upanishad says (2-4-6) 'Brahman becomes all'. The Taitliriya Upanishad, (2-7) says 'Brahman manifests Himself as the world'. The Chhandogya Upanishad, (6-2-1) also supports this. 'It says, Brahman is one only without another.' All these passages deny dualism. Does not the Gita teach the same thing? In VII-7 it says, 'There is nothing beside God'. The Gita condemns the person who supports Dualism', To this Raghavacharya could not make any reply. He merely bowed to him and took his leave.

From this place, Vallabhacharya went to Madurai. During his short stay there, at the request of the Vaishnavas of the place, he explained to them his conception of Non-duality. He told them that Non-dualism should be conceived in three aspects: (1) Bhava-advaita (depending on Bhava), (2) Karya-advaita (owing to action) and (3) Dravya-advaita (in relation to material things). The first type can be illustrated by the oneness between the threads (cause) and the cloth (effects) into which they are woven. Similarly, the universe and the soul are effects of Brahman. The second type of Brahman's oneness with the universe is explained by the principle of cause and effect as applied to the actions of living beings and occurrences in nature which are Brahamn's actions. Thirdly, there is oneness which comprehends Brahman in all things, in all the heterogenuous and apparently divergent objects and aspects, animate and inanimate, of which the universe consists. I staunchly believe in all these kinds of Brahman's oneness or non-dualism. To comprehend or realise this it requires the Grace of God and love of God. These two must go hand-in-hand. Make Him as the be-all and end-all of all your desires, aspirations and efforts".

After preaching this sermon, he resumed his journey to Rameshwaram, Dhanush-Kodi, Tanrapansa, Sri Vaikuntha Kshetra and to Agala the place associated with Ramanujacharya. Here Janaswami, the then religious head of the Ramanuja sect, gave him a warm reception and at his request Vallabhacharya addressed the audience mainly composed of the followers of Ramanujacharya, on the nature of the soul according to Brahmavada. In the course of his talk he criticised the Mayavadin's Reflection theory and the Superimposition theory. He also made it clear that, although Shankaracharya's theory was not acceptable, being contrary to the view of Badarayana, Ramanuja's theory that the soul is an attribute of Brahman, was also not acceptable. He stated however that Ramanuja and he agreed that the soul is real because it is representative of God's conscious aspect, The souls are the doers and enjoyers of fruits of action. Vallabhacharya made a good impression on Janaswami. After a few days' sojourn, he took his way to Kanyakumbha and then to Sundarsara and Padma Tirtha where he was personally requested by the King of the place to grace his palace by his presence because, he said, the queen was possessed of an evil spirit which was to be driven out by the Acharya. Accordingly Vallabhacharya visited the palace with some of his disciples. He asked one of them, Damodaradasa, to give the queen the sacred earth of Vraja, mixed with water and requested the king to make her drink the cup of water mixed with sacred earth and to have faith that the spirit would leave her. The queen was made to drink it and immediately the evil spirit left her. The king was overjoyed. He acknowledged his debt of gratitude to the Acharya, made presents of gold and silver to him which, of course, the Acharya politely declined. Departing from the place the Acharya admonished the king on his duties and exhorted him to have faith in God. He explained that faith in God is protection against evil spirits. Evil spirits have power only on irreligious and evil-minded men. Evil spirits are, really, only mental images which originate in deranged mental conditions. There can be no evil spirits in healthy-minded devotees of God. Exhorting the king thus, he gave his blessings to the Royal family for their faith in devotion and God's grace.

The Janardana Kshetra was his next place of visit. After a few weeks' stay there, he ascended Mount Malayachala and spent a few days at Kaundikunja-ashram where he gave a discourse on the aphorisms of Shandilya on devotion. Shandilya says that devotion is the only means of God-realisation but this devotion is not of the nine-fold kind (Navadha) but it is love-type. It is constant love for God which should spontaneosly flow from the heart. It is not a means to an end but an end in itself. The Gopis of Gokula and the Sage Kaundinya experienced this kind of free self-less and supreme love for God. They should therefore be considered as the Gurus of the Path. of Devotion and their love an ideal by the devotees.

Then Vallabhacharya proceeded to Mahispura where he admonished the King of the place regarding his duties and visited Srirangpattna and Subhramanya Kshetra. At the latter place he preached a sermon on the importance of the Bhagavata as a work of knowledge. He said that the Bhagavata is a work meant for all kinds of people, the rich and the poor, the high and the low. The Vedas, he opined, are intended only for the high-born castes but the Bhagavata is for all. Even the Shudras who are generally considered unfit for the knowledge of the Vedas are fit for the knouredge of the Bhagavata. It is like the Gita, the universal book, with its emphasis on the doctrine of devotion. In this Kali Age when all other means lose their force, Devotion remains as the only means of obtaining the Grace of God.

He next visited Udupi, the birth place of Madhvacharya and Gokarna. During his sojourn to Gokarna, a messenger from the King of Vijayanagar brought him an invitation, to visit once again the famous city since the Royal family and the citizens were anxious to see him. In compliance with it, Vallabhacharya set out for Vijayanagar. On the way he halted at Chandragiri where he gave his Darshana (holy sight) to many. He gave them also, a discourse on the single-minded worship of Lord Krishna. At Vijayanagar he was received with warm welcome by the King. He met his mother, maternal uncle and other relatives, and alse VyasaTirtha and Madhavendra Yati. For several days he gave a recital on the Bhagavata at the Royal Court before a large gathering. The king and the queen pressed him to settle down in Vijayanagar but he expressed his desire to visit places in the North. It was indeed a sad day for them when the Acharya bade them farewell with his blessings, imparting the following message:

"Be you all good and religious men,—God's good men, lovers of God, of all men and of fellow-creatures. Speak the truth. Be just to all. Refrain from doing injustice to anyone". Turning to the King he said "As a king you have to rule with justice but at the same time tempered with mercy. Treat all persons equally. Have faith in Lord Krishna. He is the embodiment of perfect love. You should surrender to Him in all matters. Be charitable. Never grudge succour to the distressed, the hungry, the weak and the diseased, irrespective of race and religion. Know that service of men and dumb creatures is service to God. That is all I have to give you as a parting message."

He blessed them and turned towards the North reaching Pandharpur in Maharashtra, famous for the temple of Vithoba. It is a sacred place visited by thousands of pilgrims from all parts of India every day. In that temple the idol of Lord Krishna is installed with that of his consort Rukmini. The priest in charge of the temple received him cordially. In this holy place the saints, dedicated to the worship of God, had greater influence on the religious life of the people than the Acharyas who taught them only the scriptures. The visit to Pandharpur made him decide whether he was to live as an ascetic or a householder (family man). Uptill now he was a celebate but according to the Hindu religion the period of his celibacy was nearing its end; in other words he might soon marry and start a householder's life. However, till now, the thought of marriage had not entered his mind. But one day, after prostrating himself before the two deities-Lord Krishna and his divine consort, his mend was seized with the thought of marrying, That night he felt uneasy about his continued celibacy, for according to the Hindu tradition, a man should enter a householder's life, marry and raise a family after completing his period of celibacy. According to the Smriti (scriptural injunctions) if a man does not beget at least one child his soul will be condemned to a particular kind of hell called Pum. The Upanishads also declare that the continuity of the family should not be broken by life-long celibacy. For the preservation of society, marriage is necessary. Marriage is a safeguard against evil passions and promotes a chaste, spiritual life. Marriage fulfils an important aspect of Dharma. Marriage is not primarily for the gratification of the sensual pleasures but for service to society, by procreation and moral self-discipline. Besides, it is only as a family man, that one can discharge one's duties or debts (by service or charity) to the deities, to sages, to one's ancestors, to mankind and to animals. This stage of celibacy is only a preparation for the stage of the householder. Besides, he thought celibacy is not always protective against the carnal and worldly temptations that besiege men in moments of weakness. It is one of the four stages in a man's life, according to the scriptures (1) *Brahmacharya* (period of celibacy), which affords mental and moral training. (2) *Garhasthya* (life of the householder), (3) *Vanaprasthya* (life of contemplation in retreats like forests and (4) *Sannyasa* (period of spiritual life of an ascetic which is a preparaion for the final release of the soul).

On that day The Lord Vithoba appeared in his dream in the stillness of the night and counselled Vallabhacharya, thus, "I have read your thoughts. You are destined to be a great Acharya but not an ascetic. As a householder you will preach your message of the Love of God better than as an ascetic. It is My wish that you return to your native place and marry. An offer of matrimony will come in the near future. Accept it. Two sons will be born to you. One of them should be named after Me for he will continue the propagation of the message after you". Vallabhacharya's mind was set at rest by this divine admonition which he revealed to the men of his party next day after the morning worship. They were all overjoyed at the prospect.

From Pandharpur, he proceeded to Nasik and Trambaka, holy places of Maharashtra. Then crossing the river Tapi he took a bath in the holy river and proceeded towards the river Narmada. Next he visited a small town called Mahismati, which is situated on the northern border of a forest to the south of the river Narmada. At Mahismati he gave discourse on the Bhagavata expounding the significance of an act of compassion done by King Bharata according to an episode in Chapter II of the Bhagavata. According to the story, once when king Bharata was performing penance, he espied a young deer being drowned in the river. Suspending his penance he rushed to save its life. Commenting on this Vallabhacharya explained that an act of compassion is greater than penance. Vallabhacharya remarked, "No doubt by his contact with the young animal he had to be born as a Jada-Bharat, which is far better than a life of soulless penance. Compassion to fellow-men and to the dumb fellow-creatures is love shown to God." The audience was much impressed by this sermon.

Later that day, after meals, he rested for a while, for it was a hot day. Rising from his siesta, he stepped out of his room when all of a sudden his attention was drawn to an object under the shadow of a distant tree. He could discern that it was some animal trembling all over with fright. Approaching the place quietly, he found it to be a young deer. He stroked its back, carried it to his room and gave it food and water. It rested by and seemed pleased for the protection and shelter. Just at that time, a hunter appeared and claimed it, on the plea that the animal had escaped his aim during hunting. He further recounted how his present life of a hunter was necessitated by his poverty owing to his addiction to wine, women and riotous living. He was once a wealthy man of an adjoining village.

Vallabhacharya sympathised with his predicament and made a gesture of offering the deer to him provided he did not kill it. Then the Acharya exhorted to him (for the latter was a High Caste Hindu) on the precept of the Hindu Dharma (Religion) which forbids killing. The Acharya, further, pleaded that the innocent animal had neither destroyed his crops nor disturbed his peace. "The Killing of fierce animals in self-defence may be condoned but not killing for food, since an honest, hard-working man has ample scope to live by vegetarian food. However, if a man was unable to procure food by the sweat of his brow, he could condescend to beg from charitable people, for even begging is by far better. than the killing animals for food. All life is from of God and is of God. Animals are fellow-creatures of men and they differ only in bodily structure and mental equipment. Their souls are parts of God's consciousness as ours are. Man has no right to kill when he has no power to create." So saying Vallabhacharya offered the hunter food and money and promised to hand over the deer on condition that he refrained from killing it and looked after it as his own child. The hunter was overcome by his noble and graceful look. He took only the food, declining money. He took an oath to treat with compassion not only that deer but all living beings. He hanked him for a new lease of life—spiritual life for as an animal protector, from the Acharya.

Vallabhacharya then proceeded to Ujjain where he learned from the local Brahmins about one Ghata Sarasvati who was vainglorious of his learning.

Fortunately, the king of Ujjain sponsored a religious and philosophical discussion to which Vallabhacharya was particularly invited by the vain scholar. To all questions put by him the Acharya gave satisfactory replies but when the former's turn came he failed to satisfy the Acharya. His arguments were lame and pointless. He was obstinate in his conviction in the unreality of the universe. Rebutting him, Vallabhacharya replied "If God is the creator of the universe, how can His creation be unreal?" Then the Acharya made pointed references to the sacred books supporting the theory of the reality of the universe. He further shot logical thrusts at him thus, "If the universe is regarded as unreal, you must have somewhere some other universe which must be real. Where is it? Besides, if the Universe is unreal then the knowledge which teaches release from the world, must also be unreal. On the other hand, know that the universe is real, it is God Himself and He has three attributes—form, spirit and divinity. The world is Physical, (Jagat) Spiritual (Akshara) and Divine (Purushottam). The theory of unreality is fallacious."

He began by expounding his theory of Shuddhaadvaita in a convincing and persuasive manner with the result that Ghata-Saraswati had to accept defeat and leave the place humiliated. The king became the Acharya's disciple. After this. the Acharya left for Dhavalpura. The king of the place brought rich offerings to him but they were politely declined. After five days' sojourn there, the Acharya proceeded to Mathura where he took a holy bath in the river Yamuna (Jamna). He chose a choba named Ujagara as his priest, distributed gifts among the Brahmins and gave a discourse on the Bhagavata A few days, on the eleventh day of the waxing moon (during the period called Sravana) he entered Gokula and made encampment on the Thakurani Ghata under a Shami tree. Here ends the first phase of his pilgrimage.

The Second Pilgrimage:

When he entered Gokul his mind was revolving on the important question of restoring people to the right path of devotion. During the first phase of his pilgrimage he observed that people were divided not only politically and culturally but also spiritually and religiously. Besides, the lives of many were not in consonance with the scriptural teachings. He felt that the Vedic rituals had lost their significance and the Mantras were ineffective. The holy places had lost their sanctity, the priestly class were corrupt and those that betook to religious instruction, lacked purity. which according to the 12th chapter of the Bhagavata were the signs and portents of this Age namely the Kali age (Dark Age). He conceived the souls of men into three types: (1) the worldly-minded souls, (2) the spiritually-minded souls and (3) the divine souls who aspried for the union with God through devotion (Bhakti). The Acharya was most concerned with the last kind of the souls. When his mind was exceedingly troubled over this question, he closed his eyes and meditated on Lord Krishna who appeared to him in a vision in the form Shri Nathaji. He could hear clearly the Divine words which said, "Dear one, I have heard your prayer. Your anxiety about the spiritual regeneration of divine souls is well founded. Indeed there is hypocrisy and cant in religious life and observance at present. But let not your heart be troubled over their worldly desires and indifference to spiritual virtue and divine bliss. Never-the-less I love them-Neither sacrifice, nor knowledge of yoga can enable them to obtain My Love. The only way is by self-dedication or consecration of self to Me They should realize that only by consecrating themselves, their lives, wealth, wives, children, their all to Me can they obtain key to union with Me. They should acknowledge their unstinted duty to Me with humility. Then shall I accept them. Start preaching this Message and thy mission will work like an alchemy in fusing a bond between Me and the souls yearning for Me. The voice ceased and the vision disappeared. Acharyashri related this experience to his worthiest and most beloved disciple Damodardas in the early morning. "Damala, did you hear any voice last night?" (He addressed him as 'Damala' out of affection). Damodardas replied in the negative and requested him to enlighten him on the subject, whereupon Acharyashri related his aforesaid experience and initiated him in the life of consecration to God by the holy mantra, "Krishna, I am your servant!" Vallabhacharya decided to stay there for some time as the place was in every way congenial to him.

Vallabhacharya believed Krishna as Supreme God. Mathura (where he was then staying) and the adjoining land known as Vrajabhumi are associated with the life of Lord Krishna. Krishna was born at Mathura but his early childhood was spent in Vrajabhumi. It was in this place that He performed His various lilas as described in the Bhagavata, Chapter X, Cantos 1 to 42. It was in the Vrajabhumi that the Lord used to graze his cows daily and destroyed the demons that harassed men and animals, and danced with the innocent Gopis. The place had therefore a special fascination for him. It was a centre of pilgrimage for all followers of Hinduism. Its atmosphere was holy and peaceful. It was here that Acharyashri chalked out his future programme of spreading the divine message. Also it was here that the conviction dawned on him that the time had arrived for him to preach the doctrine of Devotion and Grace. To achieve his objective he adopted a twofold method of (1) composing works, original and commentaries and (2) of preaching to his fellowers the principles of Devotion. During his stay in this place, hundreds of religious-minded persons listened to his discourses with a pin-drop silence. It is believed that besides preaching, he made writing works a part of his daily routine. It is probable that most of his scholastic works such as the Tattva Dipa Nibandha, the Anu-Bhashya on the Brahma-Sutras, a fragment of the Jaimini Bhashya, the Subodhini commentariy on the Bhagavata, and the small treatises known as Shodasa Granthas, were begun here

It occured to him that if he wanted to preach his message of devotion to God and God's grace called Pushti-Marga, he should put his thoughts in writing. He embodied each principle of his doctrine that illumined his mind each in· a small tract. In all, he wrote sixteen tracts which serve as Keys to the understanding of his system of Pushti-Marga. Their titles and a brief note on each one of them are given below. For further information the reader may kindly refer to the send section on the Summaries which give the gist of important works relating to his Philosophy.

1. *The Yamunashtaka* : This is in praise of the river Yamuna (Jumna). It symbolises love of God through which an aspirant must purify himself as a qdalification for the life of Devotion. This is the only door for entry into the Path of Grace.

2. *Balabodha :* This is an exhortation to the Children of knowledge. This was first taught to Narayandas. The Children here are the novices in the Pushti-Marga. This work refers to the 'Four Ends' of human life as taught by the Vedas and by the Sages. It lays emphasis on the fact that liberation which is the chief end is possible by devotion to God Vishnu.

3. *The Siddhanta-Muktavali:* (A necklace of pearls of principles). This work describes the fundamental concept of Pushti-Marga. i.e. of Divine service which is of three kinds: service through body, through wealth and throgh mind. These three services are rendered to Lord Krishna (God) who manifests Himself in three aspects—the physical (the Universe), the spiritual (Akshara) and the divine (Krishna). For the followers of the Puhti-Marga the last-named service is very important.

4. *Pushti-Pravaha-Maryada :* The characteristics of Pushti-souls (Divine souls) are mentioned in this work. These souls are distinguished from the worldly souls (Pravaha) and the spiritual souls (Maryada). It further explains that the goal of wordly souls is wordly happiness, that of spiritual souls, liberation, and that of divine souls, God-realisation and enjoyment of God's bliss.

5. *Siddhanta-Rahasya :* This work explains (1) The essence of the Doctrine of Grace and (2) the significance and necessity of

Brahma-Sambandha, a ceremony of the vow of consecration to God throngh the formula known as Gadya-Mantra. A holy Mantra of five letters, which expresses the sense of 'Oh Krishna, I am thy servant.'

6. *Navaratna (Nine Gems) :* This consists of nine stanzas of verse in which Acharyashri exhorts his disciples not to have cares of any kind since they have dedicated their lives God; He is merciful and helps his faithful children in all difficulties.

7. *Antah-karana-Prabodha :* (Advice to Mind). This is addressed to his own Mind. He exhorts it to regard Krishna as Great God and to serve Him steadfastly without fear or failure. service is the mark of a devotee. It is his duty to render service to God. God never forsakes His devotees even for their offencer.

8. *Viveka-Dhairya-Ashraya :* (Discrimination, fortitude and 'refuge' in God). In this work the cardinal virtues of a devotee (mentioned above) are explained. Discrimination implies submission to the will of Godinall matters and Fortitude is patience in adversity. Refuge God shrenthens fortitude.

9. *Krishna-Ashraya :* (Resort to Krishna). Vallabhacharya's God is Krishna. In this work Acharyashri explains the reason why in this Kali Age (The Dark Age) one's faith should rest only in Lord Krishna.

10. *Chatuh-sloki :* (A collecton of four verses). This work enumerates four ends of the follower of the Pushti-Marga, They are different from those prescribed in the Vedas. Lord Krishna is the ultimate end. Our efforts for wealth, duty and liberation should be directed to Devotion or God-realisation.

11. Bhakti-Vardhini : (Growth of Devotion). This work describes the three phases in the growth of love and devotion to God. They are, *Sneha* (attraction), *Asakti* (attachment) and *Vyasana* (desolation). The last is the culmination point where the necessity of God's grace becomes absolutely indispensable.

12. *Pancha-Padya* : This is a collection of five verses, describing the three kinds of listeners of God's glory-the superior, the mediocre and the inferior.

13. *Jala-bheda :* (Different kinds of Water). In this work different kinds of the reciters of God's praise are compared to different kinds of water such as sweet water, saltish water, pure water and turbid water, according to the tendencies of the minds and motives of the different reciters of God's glory This work is a psychological analysis of the reciters' frames of mind.

14. *Sannyasa-Nirnaya:* (Determination of Renunciation). In this work, he explains the nature of renunciation and the mental condition when it should be embraced. The aim of renunciation is to experience love of God in a state, separated from Him. He critically examines the positions of a Sanyasi in the state of work and that of knowledge, and of nine-fold devotion. He gives prominence to the path of love and devotion to God.

15. *Nirodha-Lakshana :* (Characteristics of Mind-control). Mind-control means engagement of the mind with all its faculties in the service of God. It means, simultaneously, detachment from worldly affairs and attachment to God. This is different from the Yoga of Patanjali which is a negative way of mind-control. This is indispensable for experiencing God's love. The fruit of Nirodha is the attainment of the Godly State or God-like state and enjoyment of God's bliss.

16. *Seva-Fala :* (The Fruits of Service). *Seva* (Divine Service) according to Vallabhacharya is a mode of God-realisation. One must know what are the fruits and handicaps and the advantages of service, This work discusses both these issues. It also warns the devotees against the pitfalls incidental to service by mind, during moments of experiencing God's love.

Besides preaching and writing works, Vallabhacharya instituted the service of Shri Nathaji, whose image was manifested to him and to some Vaishnavas from a cave in the Mount Goverdhana near Mathura.

This event is related in a work called "Eighty four Vaishnavas". Acharyashri learnt of the presence of the image or idol from one Niro, the daughter of Sadu Pande when he was residing at Anyor, a village near the place of the idol. A small temple was built and one, Ramadas a Chaudhari, was entrusted with the duty of conducting daily worship there. After some time when the necessity arose, a big Shrine was built by one Purnamalla, a rich disciple of Acharyashri. Krishnadasa was entrusted with the Managerial responsibility and Kumbanadasa, with reciting the songs of Lord Krishna's Lilas each day during service hours. The idol was shifted to Nathadwara near Udaipura, in Rajasthan, in anticipation of the trouble from the Muslims. This idol of Shri Nathaji represents Shri Krishna holding Mount Giriraja in his hand for the purpose of protecting the people of Vraja when Indra, the God of Rain, in anger for the offence committed by them, by stopping a sacrificial ceremony conducted in his honour, sent a devastating rain in vengeance. During his stay in Vraja land, Acharyashri visited various places associated with Shri Krishna. One day when he halted at the Gahvara Vana near Varsana, his attention was suddenly drawn to a big dead cobra in the adjacent field, with its body covered with and being eaten by the ants. He was deeply moved by the sight. When questioned about his sadness by his beloved disciple Deamodardas, he replied, "Damodara, look at that thing. When it was alive no insect dared approach it because they were all afraid of being devoured by it but now that it is dead, these ants, tiniest of insects, dare move on its body and feed on it. What a sad sight? What a fall! This makes me reflect on the future of a religious leader who is ambitious of fame and shirks his duty towards his followers. He will suffer a similar fate, If he fails in his duty he will be condemned by his own followers. A religious teacher must be a friend, philosopher and guide of his followers in all troubles and trials. Financial or materialstic motives will only lead a religious leader to all-round condemnation. Methinks, this dead cobra in its previous birth was onc such a false leader."

One day when Acharyashri was in Vrindavan, an ascetic named Narahari sought audience with him. Narahari had betaken himself to ascetic life from childhood and had set up his hermitage in a village on the bank of the river Mahi. The people at first reverred him until he contracted illicit relationship with a woman of the place. a low caste. Forced to wander from place to place he sought the advice and guidance of Acharyashri concerning the ascetic life. In response to his request, he said.

"The Ascetic order is not intended for all. Its secret lies in experiencing the love of God, The holy books prescribe it for those who can control their minds. Mere renunciation of the world does not make a man a true ascetic. It betrays pessimistic view of life and is fraught with dangers in the union with God through love and devotion. True asceticism is always directed towards God. An ascetic need not move about. He should not only eschew carnal relation with women but should treat them as sisters. Even to cast an evil eye or nourish an evil thought for any woman is a sin. Love of God is the highest of all loves and base love is not the ascetic's way. Pure and selfless love for all men and fellow creatures is essential for acquiring love of God. Love of God will put all other loves in the right manner. You may not be a householder but be firm in your devotion. You fell because your aim was not God. Start your life afresh with God as your goal". Narhari was converted and became Acharyashri's disciple. From Vrindavana, Acharyashri proceeded to Mathura to spend a few days there. In Mathura he contemplated a second tour of the Northern and Eastern parts of India. He spoke about it to Damodardasa and started on his second pilgrimage on an auspicious day.

The Second Pilgrimage

From Mathura Acharyashri went to Pushkara (near Ajmer) which has a temple dedicated to God Brahma and then entered a forest known as Ambica-Vana on Mount Abu on the northern border of Gujarat. There he had an argument with one Shaiva Yogi, a worshipper of Shakti (a goddess, Power). He dispelled the Yogi's mis-conceptions by these words. "All Goddesses represent forms of God but God is greater than they; because God is not merely a power but also the possessor of powers: Powers themselves cannot function except by the Will of God. No impure offerings should be made to them, as it is done, by way of animal sacrifices, flesh and wine. Animal sacrifice should be condemned. Worship of the supreme God is higher than worship of Goddesses. I am not opposed to your worship of Shakti as such except where your attitude is wrong." Shaiva Yogi realised his error and being earnest of acquiring more knowledge put Acharyashri some questions relating to Brahman and Devotion which were all duly answered. Then at his own request Acharyashri took him as his disciple.

Proceeding southwards, he crossed the Rajputana (Rajasthan) border and entered the State of Gujarat. Siddhapur was the first place visited by him. There he entered into a debate with some Mayavadins. He heard them calmly and then by the force of arguments convinced them of their error. Then he visited Patan which was a stronghold of Jainism. Some Jain Sadhus put him questions about Dharma and the proofs of knowledge. Acharyashri replied them in these words.

"Your first question is, 'what is Dharma?' Well, to put it in a nutshell, loving God and all creatures is Dharma. You believe in Pity as the Dharma. I accept it, but it is not the only Dharma. The term 'Dharma' is ordinarily understood in the sense of duty. A man has many duties which can be broadly classified under three heads —(1) His duty to himself, (2) duty to society and (3) duty to God. The third one is of primary importance. The duty which has no reference to God is not duty in the real sense of the term. I am not thereby underestimating man's duty to himself or to society but my meaning is that these should not interfere with his duty to God. The Gita has enumerated certain virtues in Chapter XVI, verses 1-3 under the head of Divine Virtues. They are fearlessnss, absolute purity of heart, absorption in meditation for self-realisation and the *satvic* form of charity, control of the senses, sacrifice, study of the scriptures, penance, straightforwardness, truthfulness, absence of anger, renunciation, peace, refraining from malicious gossip, compassion to fellow-creatures, abundance of grace, mildness, sense of shame abstinence from idle prusuits and absence of self-importance. Some of these virtues are individualistic and some are social. These are the means to God-realisation and without these, one cannot qualify for God-realisation which is the chief concept of Dharma. Whether one wants to realize God through work, knowledge, penance or devotion, all the above virtues or any of them must be cultivated. These virtues constitute Dharma no doubt but they are only a secondary aspect of Dharma, not primary which is God-realisation. The Hindu Dharma is theistic, whereas Jainism and Buddhism are non-theistic or atheistic. Jainas lay stress on non-violence in thought, word and action. The Gita also accepts it and includes it among the divine virtues. But it is only a negative virtue and has a tempering ethical effect on character. Compassion is a positive virtue. It is a milder form of love. The Bhagavad-Gita says that for God-realisation the three essential virtues are : (1) Compassion for all creatures, (2) Equanimity and (3) control of mind and senses by fixing on God as the be-all and end-all of existence. Compassion alone is not enough. It has to be augmented by the love of God. Jainism is a great religion but its aim is not God-realisation as the conception of God as a creator is alien to it. On the other hand the *Vedic* Hindu concept of compassion (Daya) derives from its belief that all creatures are 'forms' of God.

"As for proofs of knowledge, we accept only the verbal testimony of the holy books namely the Vedas, The Gita, the Brahma-Sutras and the Bhagavata. We accept the truths of other religions also if they are in conformity with our scriptures. Jainism observes distinction between absolute and relative truths but Vedic Hinduism does not do so. We believe that every where there is one Absolute Truth which manifests diversely as relative truths. Reality is one but manifests itself as many. We do not accept pluralism".

The Jain Sadhus and other distinguished scholars who heard these words were greately pleased. They admired his tolerance and depth of learning. At Patan he preached his doctrine of Pushti-Marga to the Viashnavas and made them his followers by the Brhma-sambandha Ceremony. From Patan he proceeded to Vadanagar and Visnagar and finally reached Kheralu. He made a temporary halt at a garden on the outskirts of the town. There he gave discourses on the Bhagavata on the topic relating to the Yajna-Patnis (the Wives of the Brahmins engaged in Sacrifices). Explaining the significance of that episode, he observed that the sacrifices are a means to religious life. They are forms of God, as work. But sacrifices performed for heavenly happiness cannot be an aid to God-realisation. If sacrifices are performed without attachment to fruits, they have a spiritual value in leading to purification of the mind. Sacrifices are good but charitable acts are better than sacrifices. The Yajana-Patnis by feeding hungry cowherd boys were more religious than their husbands who did not respond to their appeals to give them food. It is not within the means of all people to perform sacrifices but all can perform charitable acts at least within their capacity. Willing charity, however, small is more precious in the sight of God than anything else. Lord Krishna blessed the Yajna-Patnis for their charity.

One Brahman woman who heard Acharyashri, requested him for his guidance in these words.

"I am a very unhappy woman. My husband is the worst type of a wicked man. He keeps company with thieves and people of ill repute. My humble request to you is to leave this place before he comes to know of your stay and before harm is done by him by way of plunder to you. Kindly accept me as your follower." To this Acharyashri replied, "I am not afraid of your husband because God is my protector. You may yourself inform him of our stay here, for we have nothing of which he can rob us. I cannot accept you as my follower just now, but wait till you come to Adel. I give you my blessing that you will be a mother of two sons. I foresee that your husband will die after five years and you will then receive my blessings". Acharyashri's, words proved prophetic. She bore two sons who were named Jagannatha and Narahari. Her husband died as prophesied. after which she went to Adel and was initiated into his sect along with her two sons. From Kheralu Acharyashri proceeded to Dakor which is famous for its temple of God Ranchhodji, then to Broach, and reached Surat which is on the southern bank of the river Tapi. Going further south he halted at Durvasa-Khsetra (Dumas). There he met an anchorite practising penance and enquired of him about his motive of practising penance. He replied that his purpose was to see God but he added that God was cruel. He was not blessed by His revelation to Him in spite of his continuous prolonged penance. Hearing his complaint Acharyashri exhorted him thus. "You are mistaken. This is not the way for God's grace. If you believe in the Upanishads, I may tell you that you have erred in resorting to penance. The Kathopanishads Chapter II, verse 22 says that God is not attained by sermsons or intellect or learning. God is attained by those whom He elects as fit for His Grace. The Mundaka Upanishad asserts the same truth when it says in Chapter III, verses 2— that He is not attained by penance. Penance is physical self-torture. For God-realisation, only love of God is essential. God's love should be experienced in all our thoughts, words and deeds by directing them towards God. The Gita, in verse X, verse 53 says that God cannot be seen through penance or through the study of the Vedas or by the rituals. The next verse No. 54 empasises it 'O Arjuna, I can be seen only through single-minded devotion. So you must abjure penance and resort to devotion". Acharyashri then taught him the doctrine of the Path of Devotion. His next halt was at Bhanu Kshetra (Jambusar), in Broach district. There he gave a religious talk to the Jambuvat Brahmins of the place and then reached Kapisha Kshetra known as Kavi. Kapila was the founder of the Samkhya system which considered Prakriti and not Brahman as the Material cause of the Universe. At this place he was drawn into a controversey with the staunch savants of the Samkhya School. The controversy centred round the question of Prakriti (Matter). He refuted their doctrine of Prakriti as the material cause, basing his argument on the texts of the Upanishads, the Gita and the Brahma-Sutras. He appreciated the Samkhya's theory of Sat-Karyavada which holds the Universe as real in effect. For him that was the only appreciable point of view. He said that, according to the Vedas, Samkhya's rejection of Brahman cannot be accepted. He criticised Samkhya. philosophy as materialistic.

Acharyashri next visited Bahucharaji. Here he came into conflict with the followers of Vama Marga who used wine and flesh in religious ceremonies. Acharyashri told them that wine-drinking is a sin and that eating of flesh is forbidden by the Scriptures. Enraged at his words they threw stones at Acharyashri and his party but God miraculously protected them; for, at that moment a fire broke out and the mischief-mongers had to take to their heels. From that place he went to Tagadi a place near Dhanuhdka on the border line dividing Gujarat into the Western and Eastern Regions. Hundreds of people were attracted to his religious discourses here. He spoke about the Lilas of Lord Krishna in His Childhood as described in the Bhagavata. He taught the parents how they should treat their children.

He said that the children should be loved as the images of God. Even if they are mischievous they should not be punished. Corrective punishment is not justified. Children will improve of their own accord in obedience and service by love of their elders

The way of punishment will only make them worse. Criticism and fault-finding will only develop a hate-complex in them and will make them hostile and disobedient in later life. Yashoda had infinite love for her two children, Lord Krishna and Baladeva; but one day she became indignant with Krishna because he played mischief in breaking the milk-churning pot and ran away with the butter that was in it. She got so much excited that she resolved to punish him by binding him with cords. She made many attermpts to do so but failed. Finding her efforts futile she resorted to better method of correction, the method by love. It was a divine lesson to her. This anecdote had a special appeal to one Brahmin couple whose livelihod depended on keeping cows and by selling milk, ghee and so on. As their house was close by, they used to attend Acharyashri's discourse regularly. They were so much impressed by the anecdote that they learnt to love their children as divine images. One day when their parents were away, the two sons started eating butter from the churning pot. On returning home the father who saw them eating butter immediately rushed to Acharyashri exclaiming that Lord Krishna and Baladeva were in his house re-enacting the divine · episode. Acharyashri hurried to the spot to witness it. Acharyashri bade the Brahmin inform the mother of the occurrence before she returned to the house. She appreciated the situation and regarded them with the respectful indulgence due to God, tinged with motherly love.

From Dhandhuka, Acharyashri proceeded to Veravaal, the place which is associated with the ·memory of the Hindus as a place where Lord Krishna passed away from this world.

On the way he visited Junagadh, the birth-place of Narsinh Mehta. a great Vaishnava saint and poet. Preaching his doctrine of love and grace of God, Acharyashri reached Dwarka where he had controversy with the followers of Shankaracharya on the authenticity of the Bhagavata. After convincing them of his views he halted at Khambalia for a day and proceeded Northwards to Cutch. There he first visited lake Narayana where he initiated two Brahmin brothers of Morbi into his sect-Bala and Vada by name, since known as Balkrishna and Badarayandas respectively.

At this place the Minister of the Ruler of Sindh Province approached him for his blessings on behalf of his son, Narayan who was a cripple and afflicted with leprosy. Presenting Acharyashri with a fat purse he made the follwoing request, 'I am a Minister of the Ruler of Sindh. I am happy in every thing except my son's condition. He is affiicted with leprosy and is also a cripple. I have heard of your miraculous powers of healing. So kindly accept this humble gift and cure my son." To this Acharyashri replied, "You are not only a simpleton but also a selfish person. You have been misled in your information regarding my miraculous powers. There are no such things as miracles. You must have faith in God and pray Him. Whatever I am supposed to have done was by the name of God. If you and your son think of God and pray Him with sincere faith and devotion, God will surely hear your prayers. At the same time, know that our diseases are the result of Karma (actions) done in our previous births and therefore they have to be suffered. I cannot accept your money for I consider receipt of money for an act done for a charitable purpose as a sin against God. I do sympathise with you and I shall give you and your son my blessings in the name of God." So saying he gave his blessings, uttering the name of Lord Krishna, and passed his hand over the boy's body. Narayana and his father requested Acharyashri to pay a visit to their house at Thaththa The invitation was accepted. The boy was completely cured, without a trace of his afflictions left on his body. He was no longer a cripple now. He became Acharyashri's disciple. During his stay at Narayana Sarovara, Acharyashri entered into a controversy with one Magadha Baudha on the doctrine of Ahimsa. He pointed out some exceptions under which violence is justifiable particularly in the case of the Atatayis—a merciless and cruel gang of people who kill all and sundry, even saintly persons and helpless women and children. They do it in order to satisfy their Sadistic tendencies.

Acharyashri then proceeded to Rohari in Sindh, then to Mount Prahlad on way to Punjab. First he visited Kurukshetra. During his stay there, Jagadananda, Vasudeva, Ramananda and Shankaranada, the distinguished scholars of the Bhagavata School, attended his discourses on the Bhagavata. To Acharyashri, the Bhagavata is the greatest and holiest of books in which he was a great scholar. The aforesaid scholars of Kurukshetra had also written some excellent commentaries on the Upanishads, the Gita and the Brahma-Sutras but the Bhagavata was neglected by them. Acharyashri's impression was that the Bhagavata was not properly comprehended by people in general. He therefore made up his mind to attempt an exposition of the Bhagavata, of which the scheme had been worked out by him since a long-time This scheme involved writing a separate commentary on the Bhagavata called Subodhini explaining every verse, and a treatise consisting of the Karikas with an explanatory note on each Karika attempting to elucidate the significance of each part, including Prakaran and the chapter of the Bhagavata. As days passed, the idea of compiling the above mentioned works took a definite shape in his mind. The Pandits who attended his discourses appreciated his scheme and were so greatly impressed by his exposition of some important verses, considered that his erudition war for superior to that of other scholers. From Kururshetre Acharyashri proceeded to Haradwara (Haridwar) Lakshman- Zoola, Kedarnath and finally Badrinath, well-known for its hermitage of Badarayana Vyas who was the author of the Brahmana Sutras and the Bhagavata. He stayed for three days at this place spending his time in writing the interpretations of certain parts of the Brahma-Sutras. He visited Kanoja next, where a copper-plate was shown him by one Damodardas Sambharwala who requested him to interpret its meaning.

Acharyashri said that the plate contained symbolic representations of Avidya (Ignorance). The picture of a woman as Putana was symbolic of ignorance. Among thhe other figures namely (1) that of an ass (Dhenaka) implies surerim position of the soul on body, that of a horse (Keshi) implies superimposition of the senses, that a demon (Paralamba) implies superimposition of the mind, (4) of fire implies superimposition of the vital breath. The figure of a boy with a flute in his hands and standing under a Krishna tree surrounded by his companions and cows is, of course, Lord The maker of the plate-he said intended it to illustrate the Lilas of Lord Krishna. as described in the Bhagavata. At Naimisharayna Acharyashri gave a talk to a large audience, on the importance of Devotion. He said, "Knowledge without devotion is useless. Knowledge has for its ·goal, liberation, which is not the goal of the devotee. He seeks the Grace of God which is possible only through sublime self-less love. On the authority of the Gita, Chapter VI, one can say positively that devotion is a better means to God-realisation than knowledge. Love for God dependends, of course on the knowledge of the greatness of God which prerequisite is necessary as a preliminary of devotion-stage. When that love reaches a stage higher than Atma-Nivedan (Self- dedicattion) the devotee has no further concern with the knowledge. Devotion is the substance and knowledge, the shadow. Arjuna attained devotion only through knowledge but the cowherdesses of Gokula who were on a higher plane of devotion had no need for knowledge. Devotion may be compared to the soul and knowledge to the body. Knowledge and work have their importance in the initial stages of a devotee's career as a means to devotion."

Acharyashri then proceeded to Ayodhya and then to Prayaga and Mount Vindya. He turned eastwards visiting Sivaganga, Manikarnika, Harihar-Kshetra, Gaya, Gangasar, Vaitrani and Jagannath-Puri. Here he was involved in a controversy at the King's court in which four questions were put to him namely, (1) Who is the highest deity? (2) Which is the chief scripture? (3) Which is the most holy Mantra? and (4) which work is most important? He answered all these questions in one verse which says, "The Gita is the Chief Scripture, Lord Krishna is the Chief God, 'Lord Krishna is my refuge' is the effective Mantra and service to Lord Krishna is the Chief religious discipline." Acharyashri quoted authorities from the scriptures to bear out his answer. It is believed that the image of Lord Jagannatha in whose presence these questions were written on a piece of paper, testified to their correctness by a miraculous appearance of a divine writing. This incident raised him very high in the esteem of the king who declared him as the worthiest of the Acharyas of Hindu religion. He became his disciplie. There Narhari Joshi and Jagannatha Joshi of Kheralu in Gujarat, came to have his Darshana and receive his blessings. Acharyashri, also, admonished one Ramadas for his immoral ways and exhorted him to follow the path of devotion. Acharyashri next visited Mount Mahendra and crossing the river Godavari, returned to his village, Agrahara.

Here ends the second phase of his pilgrimage. According to some biographers this is as the third phase. Unfortunately there is no unanimity of views regarding the chronological order of his pilgrimages.

Acharyashri now settled down in Varansi (Benares) and accepted Mahalakshmi, the daughter of a Brahmin named Devambhatta, in marriage, after duly consulting his mother. The marriage was celeberated on an auspicious day in the presence of a large gathering of relatives and followers. After the wedding, Acharyashri resumed his journey starting from the Vraja land. He visited various places associated with the incidents in Lord Krishna's early life and went to Mathura and finally returned to Varanasi. One day, as he was explaining religious truths to his followers on the banks of the Ganges, a certain man approached him and with a polite bow asked whether suicide is justifiable. The man had seen one Rana Vyasa of Gujarat entering the waters of the Ganges in an attempt at suicide. At Acharyashri's bidding Rana was sent for. The latter explained his circumstances. Acharyashri then replied thus, "Suicide is the greatest sin against God. It cannot be justified under any circumstances. It is also a violence against human nature for love of life exists in every man. Man fights against death even on his death-bed. He tries to prolong life and porstpone death by medicines against disease, etc. There is no justification for suicide. It is self-inflicted, One's body is the temple of God, and one is supposed to be its protector. Life is a gift of God for service to humanity and to the Creator. Thus religionsly and morolly suicide is the greatest sin to God and the society.

"Generally despair drives a man to take recourse to suicide. Loss of money in business or commission of some shameful act, and family worries, prolonged incurable diseases or inability to maintain oneself and one's dependents etc. are some of the causes which make men dastard in life and provide motives for suicide. Still in moments of such utter despair, he must think of God, pray Him and have faith hin Him. God will surely, listen to his prayers and help him to tide over the crisis in his life. Suicide only makes matters worse." Continuing speaking to Rana Vyasa, he said "I appreciate your case. Your reason for attempting suicide is because of your failure in a religious dispute with scholars who were your opponents. You were proud of your scholarship. But what is the worth scholarship for wrangling and arguing and indulgence, not for spiritual deification and 'God-realistation'. You know the proverb : 'Pride goeth before a fall.'

"Abandon the idea of suicide and be devoted to God instead. Your learning of the scriptures should lead you to God-realisation. Forget the past and turn over a new leaf in your life. Your life is not yours but it is held in trust for God". Rana Vyasa was so deeply impressed by these words that he shed tears of repentance and begged Acharyashri's pardon for his sinful act. Thus, a soul was saved from destruction and brought back on the road of service to God.

Third Pilgrimage

This period extends approximately over four years. During this period, Acharyashri revisited some places of his first and second pilgrimages and renewed his earlier associations and contacts with his followers. Wherever he went he was hailed as the greatest Acharya of his time. He received homage from all people irrespective of caste, creed and colour. Even the scholars, who formerly disputed with him, now listened to his discourses with greatest respect. His message about Pushti-Marga—the path of God's Grace-universal religion of love embracing all kinds of people, was intended for all the rich and the poor, the Brahmins and the untouchables, the young and the old, the learned and the illiterate and even for those ostracised from society for immoral conduct. All these could obtain Grace of God, by the Pushti-Marga, if they only dedicated themselves as the true servants of God with sincere devotion. He admtted and initiated many in his religion called Pushti-Marga, reforming the drunkards, the fallen, the wicked, robbers, thieves, and so on, saving them from the evil way of living. After, thus, successfully completing his third pilgrimage he retunred to Benares where he stayed for some days.

At Benaras

He decided to settle down in Benares and devote his time in the service of God, preaching and writing original works as well as commentaries. He preferred Benares, to other places; for it was then a centre of learning where he could find distinguished scholars and savants of different Philosophical systems. Acharyashri considered it a welcome opportunity for discussing his ideas with men proficient in their subjects and comparing notes with them. His father had a house in Benares. In that city the temple of Kashi-Vishvanatha attracted thousands of pilgrims daily. For some days his divine mission went on smoothly. Each day thousands of people gathered to hear, reverently, his discourses on Brahmavada and the Doctrine of Grace and Love.

But there were some Mayavadins who were offended. They interrupted his discourses frequently with questions all of which Acharyashri answered boldly. They were a hostile group bent upon thwarting Acharyashri's mission. When all possible means failed them, they started issuing pamphlets criticising Acharyashri's faith and his teachings. This continued for some time. Acharyashri, however, cotinued his preaching with serenity, ignoring them completely. But the opposition grew stronger and stronger each day. He then thought that if he did not silence them in their pamphlet-warfare, it would be misunderstood as his weakness. Therefore he issued a booklet refuting the contentions raised by his opponents in vindication of his own princieples. The booklet was in folio form and the pages of the same were displayed near the gate of the temple of Kashi-Viswanath. This is entitled as Patravalambana (A work written and suspended as folios on the wall of the temple) in which he refuted the Mayavada and upheld the Brahmavada theory. He also urged that the Purva-Mimansa and the Uttara-Mimansa are not opposed to each other. They are the two sides to Truth like the two sides of a coin.

The teaching of sacrifice by the Purva-Mimansa and the teaching about Brahman in the Uttara-Mimansa are complementary to each other. The teaching of the Purva Mimansa is based on the Purva-Kanda of the Vedas i.e. the Samhitas, the Brahmanas and the Kalpa-Sutras while that of the Uttara-Mimansa is based on the Aranyakas and the Upanishads. The teaching of the

Vedas is two-fold, stressing both the rituals and knowledge. To lay stress only on one is only half truth. We must consider the whole truth with its two sides of work and knowledge. The Mayavadins accept only the Uttara-kanda and assert that the Uttara-Mimansa teaches knowledge only in so doing they are in error. Nor can they justify their view-point by means of authorities from the scriptural works concerned. The Vedas do not contradict themselves. The truth of the Vedas is incontrovertible, infallible and absolute. These were the main points of his booklet.

The Pandits studied the booklet and called for a meeting to discuss it, in order to prepare a counter-pamphlet as a retort but they could not muster arguments or authorities on their side. So they withdrew their opposition soon after, and peace once more prevailed. Achrayashri felt that he should shift his residence to a more secluded place, far from the madding crowd of this sort, a place which harmonises with his peaceful temperament. And so Acharyashri, after consulting his disciples and others moved to a place called Adel in the vicinity of Allahabad, a village in the proximity of the confluence of the rivers-Ganges and Yamuna (Jumna) where he could continue his writings uninterrupted. The new place had also a sanctity of its own. He set out on an auspicious day.

Nearly twenty years of his life were spent there. Even there, many relgious-mindel persons used to go to him for offering their respects and for his blessings and initiation into his sect. His fame had by this time spread far and wide. Acharyashri had two sons—Gopinath born in 1511 A.D. and Vitthalnathji born in 1516 A.D. Gopinath did not live long. Vitthalnathji became his successor whom Acharyashri taught the correct interpretation of the Brahma-Sutras and the Upanishads. He regularly attended his father's discourses on the Bhagavata and as his first disciple, was deeply impressed by Acharyashiri's mode of worship. He had a poetical aptitude. The aesthetic excellences of the Bhagavata, particularly the Lilas of Lord Krishna in his childhood and His love for the Gopis, fired his imagination to such an extent that he wrote some poems describing them.

At Adel Acharyashri started writing a commentary on The Purva-Mimansa-Sutras of Jaimini but could not complete it. But he wrote the Tatva-Dipa-Nibandha in three parts. The plan of this work was conceived at an earlier period of his life, during his first pilgrimage and its writing continued during his second and therd pilgrimages. He completed the work in Karika form (Verse form). This work is divided into three parts—the first known as 'Shastrartha Prakarana, intended to give an exposition of the nature of Brahman as stated in the Gita, the second part known as 'Sarva-Nirnaya' intended to bring out the essential truth of each Shastra (Scripture) and the third part known as 'Bhagavatartha Prakarana' intended to explain the significance of each Chapter and verse of the Bhagavata and the lilas of Lord Krishna described therein. This was a work like which . was never attempted by any other Acharya before him. He wrote a prose commentary as well, called 'Prakasha' on the first two parts, and a portion of the third part.

His next work was his celeberated commentary on the Brahma-Sutras known as 'Anu-Bhashya' which, unfortunately could not be completed owing to some unexpected circumstances. Notwithstanding, he could finish the first two chapters and nearly a half of the third. The rest was completed by his son, Vitthalanthji. In this Bhashya, Acharyashri interpreted the Brahama-Sutras in the light of his Shuddha–advaita or pure non-dualism. He commenced writing two separate commentaries on the Bhagavata. The first one was named 'Sukshma' and the second 'Subodhini'. The first exists only as a fragment and the second does not cover the whole of the Bhagavata. It is available ts now in printed form on the first, second, third, tenth and a fragment of the eleventh Skandhas of the Bhagavata. There are divergent views abont the Subodhini commentary. One view is that the commentary was really completed and that some parts must have been lost or destroyed by the wife of Gopinath, his elder son, after the latter's death. The other view is that it was not completed at all. Subodhini, in-spite of its being in an incomplete form, is the greatest achievement of Vallabhacharya. It is pre-eminent among the commentaries available on the Bhagavata. To him the Bhagavata is the greatest religious work and he felt that it had not been well interpreted till then, and in the absence of any correct exposition, it was much misunderstood. The Bhagavta interprets the truths of the Upanishads, the Gita and the Braqma Sutras. It is a great work inculcating love for God and the way of gaining his love in the form of God's Grace. In the 'Bhagavatartha-Prakasha' the method is analytical, In the Subodhini Commentary, his aim is to explain the underlying meaning of each verse and to bring the import of the words and even letters in each word. He received much help from Madhava Bhatta Kashmiri who acted as his faithful scribe. Madhava Bhatta was a disciple of Keshava Bhatta Kashmiri, a well known follower of Nimbarka faith who was very popular as a reciter and exponent of the Bhagavata. Hearing of Vallabhacharya's love for the Bhagavata and his proficiency in it, he used to attend his discourses on the Bhagavata, in Gokul, and was greatly impressed. by his expository method. Knowing that Acharyashri was badly in need of a scribe, he presented his disciple Madhava Bhatta to him. Acharyashri gladly accepted him and Madhava discharged his duty until his death caused by the arrow of some thieves who shot him at night when he had gine out of the house for nature's call.

His death was a great loss to Acharyashri who took it as the Will of God and as a divine warning not to continue the writing of 'Subodhini'. He resigned Himself to comply with the Divine will and henceforth refrained himself from every kind of literary activity.

Another reason for abandoning the work must have been, probably, his feeling that it was a handicap to his main purpose of life in experiencing God's Love. No doubt his speeches and writings had made him famous; but he was first and foremost a devotee, more than an Acharya. He remembered that he actually heard the divine call twice,—at first when he was at Gangasagar on the bank of the Ganges, and second time when he was passing through Madhuvana. The call came directing him to renounce the world and devote himself to realisation of God. In response to these calls he resolved to give up all his activities and renounce the world.

Acharyashri was then running fifty-two in age and he thaught it a mature stage in his life to sever all worldly ties. He informed his wife, sons, Damodardasa and other disciples about his resolve and succeeded in getting their consent. Damodardas, his most favourite and faithful disciple expressed desire of joining him. He had always been with his Guru in all his pilgrimages till that moment. But Acharyashri plainly refused his request saying, "Damodara, you must not accompany me. I know how sorrowful your days will be in my absence. I know what acute agony will be yours but you should know, it is God's Will. I have done my work thus far at His bidding and now I am leaving it at His bidding. It is also His will that I should leave my work, to be continued by my sons. They should continue preaching my message. You know, they are young and inexperienced and your presence is badly needed for them. You must guide all the members of my family in worldly and religious matters so that they may not feel my loss, You must, also, know that my renunciation is not like that of the ascetics but it is of a different kind. It is intended to experience God's love in separation from Him". In these words did Acharyashri explain the nature of his renunciation, as implied in his work "Sannyasa-Nirnaya". Damodaradasa at last yielded to his will with a bow.

Madhavendrapuri, a recluse of the Madhava sect was sent for and Acharyashri was ordained by him as a Sanyasi. He changed his dress for the robe of a Sanyasi. His name was dropped and a new one, "Purnananda", was adopted. For a week he remained in his house, in solitude. No body was permitted to see him. He sat before the picture of God and concentrated on Him. He uttered only God's name. At times he chanted the famous Gopi-Gita (the song of the Gopis) from the Bhagavata, which the Gopis sang during their separation from Lord Krishna, expressing their ardent desire for a vision of Him. While chanting this, tears gushed from his eyes. On an auspicious day he quitted his house bidding farewell to all. On his way to Benares he spent a week all alone, on the bank of the river Ganges. After eighteen days' journey he reached Benares and lived in a Parna Kuti (a cottage of leaves) on the Hanuman Ghat for about a week spending his last days in contemplation of God and suffering agonies of separation from Him. There were no distractions of any sort in his communion with God. He knew that the time of his passing away was drawing near. The members of his family were informed about it during these last days. They assembled near him for his last Darshana. They humbly requested him to give them his last message.

As he had taken a vow of silence, he wrote a few words on sand by way of counsel. They were in the form of three verses and a half and were as follows: "Listen to my last words. I foresee a time when you will forget God and become engrossed in worldly matters. It is likely that you will become slaves of your passions which will turn you away from the path of Devotion. Instead of rendering service to God which is your primary duty, you will fritter away your time and energy in idle pursuits. But if you follow my advice, God will not forget you. You should believe that Krishna is our God and never slacken your faith in Him, and He will surely protect you. You should regard him as the be-all and end-all of your life. Your ultimate good lies in serving Him which should be done with all your heart, mind and soul. Trust in His pro tection. Remember Him always in all your thoughts, words and deeds".

It is said that as soon as he ended, Lord Krishna manifested Himself visually on the spot and wrote in the form of a verse and a half completing Acharyashri's message and counsel thus, "If you have faith in Me you will be under my care and protection and will not suffer failure of any sort. Be free from sorrows and anxieties concerning your fnture, for it is safe in My hands. Only you should love Me with the love of the Gopis. If you do so, then you will surely secure liberation. That is the only means of union with Me, by which you will regain your original divine nature. Do not give your thoughts to worldly matters. Be devoted to Me and render service to Me by all the means at your disposal".

Soon after this Vallabhacharya rose from his seat and enterd into the waters of the Gangs singing to himself the 'Song of the Gopis' and 'The Yugala Gita' from the Bhagavata expressive of agony of separation and the keen desire to unite with God. He, also, concentrated his mind, in a meditative pose on God's Form which he seemed to be beholding as if in a vision. And lo! a brilliant flame in the form of God arose from the waters and whisked him away in the sight of thousands of men, women and children who had congregated there to have his last sight.

This event took place on the third day of the waxing period of the moon, in the month of Asad, in the Samvat year 1587 i.e. 1532 A.D.

Dr. Wilson describes this event in his book on Hindu Religion, thus—

"Having accomplished his mission he is said to have entered the Ganges at Hanuman Ghat, when stooping into the water, he disappeared and a brilliant flame arose from the spot and in the presence of a host of spectators, ascended to heaven and was lost in the firmament" According to the belief of the followers of the Pushti Marga, his soul returned to the presence of Krishna to participate in eternal bliss with Him. Acharyashri had left two sons. One was Gopinath who was twety years old and the other Vitthalesji, who was fifteen. The two brothers were well educated and trained under the guidance of Damodardas for shouldering the duties and responsibilities of the head of their father's new faith. Gopinatha left this world at Jagannath Puri and his only son Purushottama soon followed him. Vitthalesh (1516-1576 A.D.) was now the sole representative of Vallabhacharya. He, like his father, was fully equipped with learning. He continued the tradition of his father. He toured the country many times and preached his father's gospel. He has to his credit several works of great merit like 'Vidwan-Mandana', 'Bhakti-Hetu', 'Bhakti-Hansa', 'Tippani' on the Subodhini, and poetical compositions like 'Srinagara-Rasa-Mandana', etc. He completed unfinished commentary on 'The Anu-Bhashya' of his father, interpreting the Brahma-Sutras. He wrote also commentaries on some of his father's Sixteen works, He had seven sons and two daughters. He was recipient of a great honour from Emperor Akbara who conferred upon him the title of "Goswamy" by which his descendants are all usually known. He had many devout followers but two hundred and fifty two of them were his chief-followers. He admitted men of all classes to his faith. The kings of Hindu States, land lords and other rich people recognised him as a chief religious preceptor of the Pushti-Marga. He made his father's faith very popular during the Muslim Era. He left this world at the ripe age of seventy two near the sacred hill of Govardhana in Gopalpura where his father had set up the image of Shri Nathaji.

Vitthalesha had seven sons,—Girdharji, Govindrayji, Balkrishnaji, Gokulnathji, Raghnathji, Jadunathji and Ghanshyamji, who established their own separate gadis or seats of learning. All these sons and their descendants known as "Goswami Maharajas" popularised the new faith. and enriched its literature by independent works. The chief centre of Vallacharya's faith is Nathdwara in Rajasthan, which has a Shrine of Govardhannathji. The image originally was on Mount Govardhan but subsequently it was removed to this place out of apprehension of danger from Muslim rulers.

The places where Acharyashri made temporary halts and gave religious discourses to people during his pilgrimages, contain buildings known as Baithakas (seats of preaching) which are still preserved as memorials of Acharyashri. Thousands of pilgrims visit them and purify themselves by the Darshana of Acharyashri's image or some symbols representing him. They are situated in secluded places in the midst of natural surroundings, either on the bank of a river or at the foot of a hill or in some groove on the outskirts of some village or a town.

Vallabhacharya, as it has been pointed out at the outset, founded a new School of Indian Philosophy called Shuddhaadvaita,—the Philosophy of pure non-dualism of Brahman, which does not accept the Maya principle. He reoriented the then existing Vaishnava religion, basing it of course on the cult of Devotion and gave it a new name of Pushti-Marga—the path of Love and Grace. It is a reformed version of the Hindu religion. It has a large number of folowers all over India. After Vallabhacharya and Vithalnathji, Gokulnathji continued his efforts to preach the divine message of Vallabhacharya. Eminent Sanskrit scholars and writers like Purushottamji, Hariraiji, Kalyanrayji, Girdharji, Gopesvarji, Lalubhatji, Gattulala and others, enhanced the reputation of Vallabhacharya's sect by their scholarly works of a highly religious and philosophical character in Sanskrit.

Chapter II

VALLABHACHARYA AS A PHILOSOPHER

"Supreme Reality (God) is one but the learned describe it as manifested in Multiple forms." *Rig-Veda.*

*There is always the personal and the impersonal side of the Divine and the Truth and it is a mistake to think the impersonal alone to be true or important for that leads to a void, incompleteness in part of the being while only one side is given satisfaction. Impersonality belongs to the intellectual mind and the static self, personality to the soul and heart and dynamic being. Those who disregard the personal Divine ignore something which is profound and essential.**

— *Shri Arvinda*

After mentioning some important incidents in the life of Vallabhacharya, we shall, in this chapter, attempt to elucidate his philosophy.

Before we come to his philosophy, let us try to understand the meaning of the word 'philosophy' in the sense of which it is understood by the Hindu Philosophers in general and by him in particular. The Hindu concept of philosophy is not the same as that of the Western Philosophers. To the Western Philosophers, the word 'philosophy' commonly conveys the sense of metaphysics—the science dealing with knowledge only. Etymologically, it means 'love of learning'. The Western Philosophy usually takes it for 'intellectual quest for truth'. It is also used for 'wisdom'. The Hindu Philosophers do not understand it in this restricted sense, for, if it meant only knowledge of the wolrldly subjects or if it meant wisdom, then it must include knowledge of morality only. The Hindus, no doubt, mean by it knowledge, but it is chiefly 'Knowledge of God or the Ultimate Reality'—the knowledge by which the individual soul becomes free from ignorance and worldly bondage and realises God. The word 'Veda' means 'knowledge of the Reality', The Upanishads also convey the same sense. The knowledge which does not enable one to realise God or free one from worldly bondage, has no value. Its principal subject is God and soul's relation to God. It does not only give us direct apprehension of God, but also indicates the way of communion with God. It is Vidya, no doubt, but it is *Brahma-Vidya.* Brahman or God is the ultimate goal, who is to be known by *Brahma Vidya* or Philosophy.

---

*(From letters of Shri Aravind—second series, p. 206)

According to Vallabhacharya, Knowing means realising God, not intellectually but intuitively. So Vallabhacharya's philosophy is not conceptual, although intellect has been made an instrument in interpreting his philosophy.

His philosophy is a faithful interpretation of the Upanishadic philosophy, which he thought was not properly explained by his predecessors. He explained his philosophical thoughts in his works —(1) The *Anu-Bhashya* (2) *The Tattva-Dipa-Nibandha* and (3) *The Subodhini,* a Commentary on the Bhagavata.

History of Indian Philosophy in a nutshell :

Before we come to the subject of Vallabhacharya's philosophy, let us cast a glance at the History of Indian Philosophy, to understand the chronological order of Indian philosophy.

The History of Indian philosophy is broadly speaking divided into three periods: (1) The Vedic (2) The Upanishadic and (3) the post-Vedic, which may be called (a) the Cosmological (b) the Metaphysical and (c) the Systematic, representing three different stages of the development of the philosophical thought.

The Philosophy of the Vedic period means the philosophical thought constained in the *Rigveda Samhita.* It is followed by the Upanishads. They are many, but 10 or 11 are most important. They contain germs of all the later philosophical speculations. They are the first attempts to comprehend the Reality. The post-vedic is called the Systematic period, which saw the development of the six systems—orthodox as well as heterodex systems such including Buddhism, & Jainism. Of these systems, Buddhism and Jainism deny God but raise the personalities of their founders to the status of God. The Sankhyas and Mimansakas deny God and the Vaisheshika and Nyaya, no doubt, accept God, but the God-element is not a fundamental point in these systems. However these systems accept the authority of the Vedas in theory.

These six systems are independent. They study the Upanishadas critically and form their own judgment about their teachings. The Samkhyas are dualists and the Nyaya Vaisheshikas are pluralists. The Purva-Mimansa is ritualistic. The only system which conforms to the Upanishads is the Uttara Mimansa, commonly known as Brahmasutras of Badarayana or the Vedanta. It has exercised the greatest influence on the latter philosophical systtems. It drew attention of many great Acharyas in India, who wrote scholastic commentaries on it, each one deriving a particular philosophy from the text of the Brahmasutras.

The Brahmasutras are written in the aphoristic style. The whole work is divided into four chapters. Each chapter is again divided into four *padas* and each *pada* into several *adhikaranas*, containsing irregular number of the Sutras. It is the aim of the author of the Brahmasutras to explain the philosophical ideas of the Upanishadas concerning God, the world, the souls, liberation etc. Out of the interpretations on the Brahmasutras are evolved several schools of Indian Philosophy based upon the Upanishadas. They are principally classified into 3 divisions. (1) *Advaita* (Monism) (2) *Dvaita* (Dualism) and (3) *Dvaita-advaita.* Dualism-cum-Monism. The *advaita* has five branches:—

1. Bhartriprapanch's Samuchchaya–Vada (650 A.D.)
2. Shamkara's Kevala-advaita (789-820)
3. Ramanuja's Vishishta-avdaita (1017-1137)
4. Vallabha's Shuddha-advaita (1479-1530)
5. Vijnana Bhikshnu's Avibhaga-advaita (1650)

The *Dvaita* school is represented by Madhva. The Dvaita-advaita has two branches (1) Bhaskara's Aupadhika Bheda-abheda (1000 A.D.) and (2) Nimbarka's Svabhavika Bheda-abhedavada (990 A.D.)

Ordinarily it is believed that Shamkara was the first commentator of the Brahmasutras, but it is not so. Bhartruprapancha was the first commentatator and a predecessor of Shamkaracharya. His literature is not available but on the strength of Shamkara's references to his docttrines, it is believed that he was an advocate of *Samuchchaya-Vada*—the theory of knowledge and action as a means of Reality.

Shamkara believes in Monism only, (Non dualism) Ramanuja in qualified Monism (Non-dualism) Vallabha in pure Monism (Non-dualism). Madhva in Dualism. Bhaskara believes that dualism is due to Upaḍhi and therefore it is not real. Only non-dualism is real. Nimbàrka on the other hand propounds that dualism is natural and therefore real, but non-dualism or Monism is not real.

Let us now turn to the philosophy of Vallabhacharya. He derives from the Brahma-Sutra his philosophy of Shuddha-advaita. The philosophy of Shri Vallabhacharya is popularly known as Shuddha-advaita in the scholastic world. To distinguish it from other forms of philosophy such as Kevaladvaita of Shri Shamkaracharya, Avibhag-adviata of Bharturprapancha and Vishishta-advaita of Ramanuja, he designated it as Akhanda-or Akhanda Brahma-Vada-Impartite Non-dualism (T.D. 1-927) He says that Brahman is indivisible. This kind of knowledge comes to the spiritual aspirant, when he knows Brahman in everything. To aver frankly, Shri Vallabhacharya does not often use the word Shuddha-advaita in his works. However, he uses the word 'Shuddha-advaita' once only in his 'Subodhini' a commentary on the Bhagavata[1], where he distinguishes between self-knowledge and God's knowledge. The self-knowledge tends to sublate ignorance; but God's knowledge enables one to realise non-difference of the soul from Brahman. When the self knowledge is assisted by God's knowledge, we have the knowledge, of pure nondualism (*Shuddha-advaita*). The word '*Shuddha*' was added to *Brahmavada*, by Shri Vitthaleshji—the son of Shri Vallabhacharya. Shri Purushottamji uses the word *Shuddha-advaita* in his commentary on *Tattva-Dipa-Nibandha* of Shri Vallabha. Shri Giridharaji got the clue for it from his predecessors and wrote *Shuddha-advaita-martanda* in which he popularised the Shuddha-advaita.

It is probable that in common parlance, Shamkara, Ramanuja, Madhva, Bhaskara, Nimbarka and others also, were recognised as advocates of Bhahmavada. It was necessary to give it such a name, so that it can be clearly distinguished by its salient characteristics from other forns of Brahmavada and it is is this that necessitated the coinage of the term ·Shuddha-advaita).

Explanation of the Word 'Shuddha-advaita':

It is a compound word consisting of two words—'Shuddha, Pure and 'Advaita'—Non-Dualism—meaning a philosophy which teaches pure non-dualism. To express this sense, the word '*Shuddha-advaita*' which is the most appropriate was used by Giridharaji (Sh. M. 27-29). It is to be understood as a Karmadharaya compound, having the relation between the first word 'Shuddha' and the second word 'Advaita' that of an adjective and a substantive. Taking it as such, it means that everything is pure—non-dual. The world and the souls are non-different from Brahman, being of God's essence. They are as real as Brahman. It can be taken as a Genetive Tatpurush-compound also with 'Shuddha' in the dual number, meaning non-differenc of the objects, i.e. the world and the souls from God. It implies that the conscious and the unconscious, the names and forms, and also the cause and the effect are pwre essence of Brahman.

---

[1] 10-2-35.

Although the words *Akhanda-advaita* used by Vallabhacharya and Purushottamaji in their commentaries on '*Sarva-abheda*' used by the author of the Brahma-Sutras were not used by Giridharji, they are adequate enough to explain the nature of Vallabhacharya's philosophy. If *Akhanda-advaita* were adopted, it would have been confounded with the *Avibhaga-advaita* of Bhartuprapancha, which is essentially different from Vallabhacharya's philosophy. Again *Sarvaa-bheda* also would not be appropriate, for if it meant 'Non-duality of Sarva' (All-Brahman) then what about the world and the souls? Are they to be supposed as different from Brahman? This is not the sense intended by Vallabhacharya. If Brahman is non-dual, the world, and the souls as its parts must be non-dual. It is to avoid confusion with such an interpretation, that Giridharji designated this philosophy as 'Shuddha-advaita' (Pure Non-dualism). The Shaiva School of Indian Philosophy understands its philosophy also as Shuddha-advaita, but by it, it means that difference is real in existence, but inseparable in consciousness.

Proofs of Knowledge (Pramaṇas):

The Aim of Shuddha-advaita philosophy is the knowledge of Brahman. For attaining Brahman, knowledge of Brahman's nature is absolutely necessary. This system lays particular emphasis on the love type of devotion as a means for the attainment of Brahman. It, however, does not ignore importance of knowledge. It believes that Devotion must be preceded by knowledge so that one should understand the nature of Brahman, to whom devotion is to be directed. The problem of knowledge is in the forefront in all the systems of philosophy—Occidental as well as Oriental. All the systems have discussed how to get the right type of knowledge and by what proofs it is to be arrived at. Each system has its own view about the validity of knowledge. *Charvaka*, who was a materialist, trusted only in perception for the validity of knowledge, pertaining to the worldly matters. He did not believe in the existence of God. The *Buddhistic* school known as *Swatantra-Vijnanavadis* accept perception, inference and verbel Testimony as Pramanas, but it is opposed to the idea of God. Jainism supports the theory of perceptual knowledge, assisted by conception or thought, which is both perceptual and inferential knowledge. To this is added *Shruta* or Knowledge from authority. It admits two kinds of knowledge—mediate knowledge and immediate knowledge, which is got through clairvoyance, telepathy and omniscience. The omniscience-knowledge is unlimited and absolute, transcending space, and time and is to be achieved by the liberated souls. This knowledge can be obtained in two ways by Pramanas in which knowledge of a thing is got as it is; and by Nyaya way in which knowledge is obtained in relation to another thing. This knowledge is not invalid. It is valid relatively only.

The Nyaya-Vaisheshika Schools accept four proofs namely, Perception, Inference, Verbal Testimony and Analogy. The Mimansakas add to these, implication and negation. By Verbal Testimony, the Mimansakas mean the Vedas exclusive of the Upanishadas as proofs. Shamkara relies upon *Shruti* (Reveletation), Reason (Discursive Intellect) and intuition. In case of conflicts among the *Shrutis*, reason or intuition must be relied upon. Ramanuja accepts Perception, Inference and Verbal Testimony (The Vedas etc.).

Now let us consider Vallabhacharya's view of knowledge. He accepts the necessity of right knowledge for comprehending the nature of Reality of *Brahman.* He however, rejects all other proofs, except Verbal Testimony, by which he means the scriptures viz., the entire Vedas inclusive of the Brahmanas, Aranyakas and the Upanishads, the Gita, the Brahma-sutras of Badarayana and the Bhagavata. The Puranas, the Purva-Mimansa, the epics, the Smriti works, and other works by sages and pious thinkers, writers and the poets are also accepted, provided their teachings do not conflict with those of the above scriptures (T.D.N. I-7 to 9) Shankara and other Acharyas accept only the Vedas, the Gita and the Brahma Sutras, but Vallabhacharya adds the Bhagavata, making thus four *Prasthanas* as authoritative instead of three, in the matter of the knowledge of Brahman. Of these scriptures he considers the Bhagavata as the highest authority. Whatever is written therein, has to be accepted as absolute truth without contradiction or hesitation. The Vedas which are senior-most in time are a base of spiritual knowledge. The Gita is the superstructure and the Brahmasutras, a complete edifice, but the Bhagavata is regarded as the beauty and the charm of the completed edifice. For knowledge, first of all, we should turn to the Vedas. In case of any doubt in the teaching of the Vedas, we must seek guidance from the Gita. The doubt with reference to any teachings of the Gita should be solved by the Brahma Sutras. In case any doubt still remains, then, we must seek guidance from the Bhagavata, which is the last and the highest authority. Authority of the Bhagavata in addition to the Vedas, the Gita and the Brahma-Sutras is the characteristic feature of the Shuddha-advaita system.

Now let us try to understand why Vallabhacharya accepts Verbal Testimony i.e. the scriptures; and rejects all others.

(1) Perception is useful for worldly knowledge which is to be got through senses and mind, but knowledge of God cannot be got through senses. God cannot be cognised by our senses and mind. He can be known only if He reveals Himself to the devotee, of His Own Will. Again as our senses are defective, our perception can also be defective. It will give wrong knowledge. On account of defective operation of the eye-sense, a rope is mistaken for asnake. Seeing God is different from the knowledge by perception, but it is not by means of physical senses. So perception cannot be accepted.

(2) Inference:—knowledge of Brahman cannot be had by reasoning. It may be useful in knowing worldly things, but not in the knowledge of God. Again, in the reasoning process, there is no unanimity of knowledge among the reasoners. Each reasoner hass his own point of view. The knowledge from reason is partial and at times defective. If the data of inference are defective, for exam-

ple, defective induction, mal-observation etc. the inference will be misleading. Logical method of inference is not satisfactory as a proof for the existence of God.

(3) Analogy also cannot be accepted. It is based on resemblance between one thing, like a cow with another, an animal like a *Gavaya*, resembling the cow. This is useless for the knowledge of God because God has none else like Him. We cannot point out to any object and say 'God is like this object.'

(4) *Arthapatti*:—Implication or postulation cannot be accepted. It is of two kinds-*Pratyaksha* based on the perception of an object and *Shruta*-based on hearing. The example of the first is of Devadatta, who is alive, but is not in the house. From this we know about Devadatta that he is out of the house. This knowledge of his being out of the house, is based on perception. We, ourselves look for him in the house, but we do not see him, so we conclude that since he is alive and is not inside the house, he must be somewhere outside the house. The example of the second type is,-we, hear somebody say 'Shut', we know that he wants us to shut the door. Here we get our knowledge from hearing. Both these kinds of Arthapatti do not deserve to be accepted as an independent proof, since this knowledge is the resultant of the combination of perception and inference, it is perception because we first see or hear, and inference because we arrive at the knowledge that the man must have gone out of the house or that the door must be shut. This kind of proof is a mixed proof by perception and inference. But Brahman is not one whose knowledge can be got either by perception or inference, or by the combination of both.

5. *Anupalabdhi:* This is a proof of knowledge from negation or absence of a thing. Since Brahman is everywhere present and no where absent, this proof does not deserve consideration. So according to Vallabhacharya the only proof worth consideration is the Verbal Testimony (shabda). But here it must be made clear that Vallabhacharya does not accept the Verbal Testimony of the worldly people. Verbal Testimony is defined by the Nyaya school as "the words of a trustworthy person". But whom should we consider trustworthy among the worldly people? Each one thinks that he is correct in his particular view. Even leaders among men, philosophers and thinkers are mistaken in holding

their own view as correct. If one great man in whose words his followers put utmost trust, says, 'Do this' and if another great man of equal importance says, 'Do not do this,' who should be obeyed? Both are great men in their own way. Both cannot be correct. If one says performance of sacrifices is a Dharma and if another says, sacrifices should not be performed, it is not Dharma but knowledge is Dharma; whom should we consider as trustworthy. Another person denies this and asserts that devotion is Dharma. If one holds up an ascetic's life as an ideal and the other the life of a householder as that, whom whould we consider trustworthy? Even in the matter of worldly knowledge, verbal testimony creates confusion and doubt. The opinions are always different. There is no unanimity among the thinkers. Verbal Testimony of worldly persons is often vitiated by the fact that it is often borrowed or based upon hearsay reports. It is not self-acquired knowledge. It very often turns out to be prejudicial. Vallabhacharya, therefore, rejects the verbal Testimony of worldly men, but accepts only the Verbal testimony of the scriptures which are revelations of God or God-inspired persons.

Validity of Knowledge:

On the question of validity of knowledge different views prevail in various systems of Indian Philosophy as to whether it is intrinsically valid or not. Buddhism regards knowledge as invalid intrinsically and becoming valid through extraneous circumstances. The Samkhya believes that the validity and invalidity both are self evident. According to the Nyaya-Vaishesika schools, the validity and invalidity of knowledge are due to extraneous circumstances. The Mimansa school maintains that knowledge is intrinsically valid though its invalidity is due to extraneous circumstances. Shamkara identifies Brahman with knowledge and says that to know all things as Brahman is valid knowledge. To know that a jar is not a jar, but is Brahman, is correct knowledge, but to know a jar as a jar different from Brahman is incorrect. This incorrect knowlege is due to Maya or Upadhi. To Ramanuja and Vallabhacharya, knowing all things as Brahman even in their apparent form is a valid knowledge. Ramanuja thinks that the world and the souls are attributes of Brahman. They were inseparable from Brahman in a casual state, and have been manifested as effects. The effect-forms of Brahman are as real as the cause. They are not due to Maya (illusion) Vallabhacharya agrees with Ramanuja, but differs from him in holding the world and the souls as *Amsas* parts of Brahman's *Sat* (Being) and *chit* (Consciousness) aspects.

As said above, Vallabhacharya accepts only the testimony or the scriptures as authority for the knowledge of God. He is an advocate of the path of devotion and he says that the aim of devotional life being God-realisation, the other kinds of proofs Viz. perception, Logical reasoning or inference and analogy and also the word-testimony of the worldly people are of no use. The Upanishads mention three modes of knowledge-perception, logical understanding and intuition. Perception and logical understanding will do only for the things existing in space or time. Even there, they are not sometimes safe guides. Kant discredited them in the case of knowledge of the Absolute or ultimate principle. He recognised only intuition, the inner mental faculty by which knowledge comes from within, self-revealed in unexpected moments. It is the primary knowledge. Bergson describes it as supra intellectual faculty or a supra sensible intuition. Bradley supports it by saying that the intellect is inadequate to grasp the supreme Reality. For thinking, intellect is alright. We do not want only to think of God, but want to realise or experience Him in our heart. The religious soul does not require proofs for the existence of God. Existence of God is, to him, an axiomatic truth. God is self-existent, self-luminous. Neither our sense data, nor our powerful intellect can help us in the apprehension of God. He is to be realised by one's own intuition, experience or the knowledge gained from the scriptures. The Scriptures are intended to guide the religious soul in his desire to experience God; by showing the nature of God and the way to realise it.

The scriptures are nothing but the records of experiences of pious sages or seers. What they themselves have experienced they have registered in the scriptures. They are the sayings of the inspired men under the guidance of God. To get the knowledge of God they isolated themselves from the world by discarding all intercourse with worldly people and retiring into some solitary place, far from the busy throngs of men, and closing their eyes on the external world, meditated upon God only and in that state, the knowledge was revealed to them. Which is registered in the scriptures. The scriptures to Vallabhacharya are infallible and full of absolute truths for all times. They are records of the intuitive experiences of the holy person of the Vedic times. They are of three kinds, (1) The *Shruti* words —the Upanishadas containing knowledge of revelation from within It was like the knowledge heard by the inner faculty (2) The *Smritis* based upon the Shrutis, called 'the remembered knowledge' or the knowledge of the Shrutis, reproduced in the words of the post-vedic Sages. Of these, the Gita is the foremost (3) The Puranas giving detailed knowledge about God's Lilas and the modes of experiencing God. The Bhagavata is superior to other Puranas. All these are accepted as authoritative. Other works of similar kind are also accepted provided their teaching is not antagonistic to the teaching of the above scriptures. Only Scriptural testimony is preferred to other kinds of proofs of knowledge by Vallabhacharya because they contain knowledge, not gained by sense data or intellect but through the intuitive faculty of God-inspired, holy men, free from all worldly ties and given only to meditation of God.

The authoritativeness of the *Shrutis* and the *Smrities,* as verbal testimony, is accepted by Dr. Radhakrishnan in his "Introduction to the Brahmasutra." in these words.—The authoritativeness of the Vedas in regard to the matters stated in them is independent and direct; just as the light of the sun is the direct means of our knowledge of form and colour. The Vedas are the authoritative utterances of inspired seers claiming contact with transcendental truth. They are the statements of their metaphysical experience. Smriti will have to reckon with the Shruti and should be consistent with it. Shruti has no authority in the realm of the perceptible. It is the source of knowledge in matters transcending sense-experience." Vallabhacharya trusts Shruti for all kinds of knowledge. The Vedas, according to him, are not the works of human authors. They are divine (*Apaurusheya*) revelations of God. Metaphorically they are described as the breath of God. The Gita is said to be God's speech and the Bhagavata, the very body with the soul of God. These work are directly connected with God. Hence they are accepted as absolute and the only authority in the matter of the knowledge of God.

All knowledge is valid including the knowledge of an error because according to him, the error is regarded as an attribute of Brahman.

The problem of knowledge in the Shuddha-advaita system has been well considered by Purushottamji in his work "*Prasthana Ratnakara*". There the problem is treated under two heads—Pramana (Epistology) and Ontology (*Prameya*) .The problem of knowledge is considered in three forms with reference to the nature of God, the souls and the world i.e. as knowledge, as a knower and as knowable, though they are separate, in fact they are not so. They are three forms of God. Knowledge form of God is indicated in a Shruti—'Brahman is Truth, knowledge and joy, His form as a knower is manifested in the soul-form, which represents His consci ousness. His knowable-form is fourfold and is manifested in the world and which represents His 'Being' aspect. Knowledge whose locus is God is four-fold "manifested as His nature, as His attributes, as the Vedas, and as the words. Knowledge as the nature of God is like the sun. As an attribute, it is like a ray of the solar disc; as the Vedas, it is like earth where the light of the sun is spread and as the words, it is like reflection of the sun. The knower-form is the soul that knows Him by means of words, which is also the form of God, expressive of knowledge.

The knower's knowledge of the knowable i.e. the world is five fold through (1) External organs and (2) by four internal organs mind (3) intellect (4) ego (5) and Chitta.

Thus according to Vallabhacharya knowledge of God is tenfold. Four fold with reference to God, five fold with reference to a knower (*Pramata*—Soul) and one fold with reference to the world. The four-fold knowledge gives us the knowledge of God in a causal state and the rest in the effect state. The first kind of knowledge pertaining to the nature of God is to be realised by the soul by God's grace and the rest is to be achieved by soul with the aid of external and internal organs. Although the knowledge obtained through organs is not of a permanent nature, it is not momentary or lasting only for three moments. It undergoes a change no doubt, but it is not subject to modification, because essentially it is the form of God. It is to be got by the study of the scriptures. Just as a seed sown in the ground requires sprinkling of water till it becomes a full plant; our knowledge about God needs constant perusal and meditation of the scriptures and contact with holy persons. Otherwise the seed will not come out or even if it comes out, it will not grow into blossoms, and flowers, and bear fruits. Such study is useless because it does not help us in realising God.

According to Vallabhacharya knowledge is again of three kinds,—The *Sattvika*, the *Rajasa* and the *Tamasa*. The *Sattvika* knowledge is called *Nirvikalpa* knowledge, the knowledge by which one knows Brahman in all things, without apprehending differences or determinations. It differs from the Nirvikalpa knowledge of the *Nvaya*, according to which it means knowledge of an object arising in the first movement of the contact of the mind and the senses with an external object. This knowledge is indefinite. We know the object but do not know its exact nature. We only say that we perceive an object, but we have no definite recognition as to what it is. It is something, but not a particular thing, revealing its real form. The Shuddha-advaita school does not understand *Nirvikalpa* —knowledge in that sense. It is not the knowledge of any worldly object, but knowledge of God as one in all things, the knowledge without differences. The Rajasa knowledge is *Savikalpa* —the knowledge showing differences. By it, a man knows all the objects, not as God but as different ones, from God. This is empirical knowledge. It is of five kinds (1) Doubt (2) Contraraiety (3) certainty (4) memory (5) sleep. Doubtful knowledge and contrary knowledge do not give trustworthy knowledge. The memory knowledge is distorted or dim knowledge retained in the mind from past impressions. The knowledge in sleep is of no use. Only, knowledge of 'certainty' is taken as valid knowledge. The *Rajasa* knowledge does not help one to comprehend Brahman. The only knowledge worth seeking is the Sattvika kind of knowledge of Indeterminate Brahman. This knowleidge s to be obtained only from the Vedas, or the scriptures like the Gita. the Brahma Sutras and the Bhagavata or any similar holy books, revealing Brahman as *Shabda Brahman*. In short valid knowledge arises from intellect with predominance of Sattava following purity of heart and study of scriptures.

So, according to Vallabhacharya the only authority for the knowledge of Bhaman is the scriptures. He rejects perception, inference, Verbal Testimony of wordly persons and Analogy. Experience of God's revelation to the devotee, in the perception condition, or in a dream, or in memory, are no doubt accepted, as genuine, only as mystical experience which is different from the logical knowledge by perception etc. The aim of knowledge is to experience God in all things and in all forms. The so called differences of the objects as a jar, a cloth etc are also God's manifestation of His particular attribute such as jarness in a jar and clothness in a cloth. Thie is pure (*Shuddha*) non-dualism.

If Reality as God is one, how is it that the objects like jars are not comprehended as God or a rope is mistaken for a snake? Why should truth appear as untruth or as an error? Vallabhacharya explains this by saying that it is due to wrong construction of the intellect. Our intellect is of three kinds-the *Sattvika,* the *Rajas* and the *Tamasa.* Under the influence of the Sattvika, it will perceive all objects as God without any difference. They will be comprehended as God's Being; expressive of God's reality, revealing some special attribute of God, like jarness etc. The objects are many, but they are only diverse forms of one Reality. The intellect under the influence or predominance of the *Rajasa* quality prevents one from seeing these objects as God's forms. Time is also responsible, along with other accessories, for wrong knowledge. The impressions of the object experienced before and retained in the memory are projected on to the object of perception, and the real nature of the object is not cognised. The jars are not comprehended as revealing God, but as different from God. If the intellect is purified and enlightened by the Sattva quality, one will know the jar as God.

Shamkara identifies knowledge with Brahman. Vallabhacharya regards it as God's form and also as His attribute. Being essence of God, it is eternal. He rejects Buddha's theory of the momentariness of knowledge. It has varied stages and conditions, but in all of them, it reflects permanent character of knowledge. The fault lies with the intellect. For the correct knowledge of all things as expressive of God's reality, our intellect should be purified by the study of the scriptures, contact with saintly persons who have themselves realised God, meditation of God's image and devotion to God.

Existence of God: 'God is All in all' in Vallabhacharya's philosophy. He is the ultimate principle. He is self-existent. He is to be known, felt and experienced without requiring any proof for His existence.

Various theories have been advanced, both in the West and the East, to establish the existence of God. The ontological the cosmological and the telelogical theories are well known in the West, each endeavouring to prove the existance of God. But Kant found them all defective and advanced his moral theory, saying that if there were no God, the moral order of the world, would be disturbed and men would go on committing wrongs and injustices to their fellow beings without any fear of punishment. In the East, the Sankhya is silent about God. The Yoga system has introduced God only as a support for meditation. The Nyaya system brackets God with the souls, regarding Him as super soul. Udayana proves the existence of God by the following arguments (1) Since the world is an effect, it must have some cause and that is God. (2) There must be some one in the beginning who must have set the atoms in motion and that is God. (3) As the earth remains hanging in space, one must suppose that it must have been held by God. (4) As this world is created, so it will be destroyed. For its destruction also one must accept God, who is an Agent. (5) Each word has a particular meaning. It must be due to the will of God (6) The Vedas which deal with merits and demerits affirm that there is God. (7) As the accretion of the mass of Atoms depends upon their number at the time of creation, it presupposes some one (God) who must have conceived their number.

All these arguments of the Eastern as well as those of the Western Scholars are unavailing. They have been rejected by Shamkara, Ramanuja, Madhava and Nimbarka. Vallabhacharya does not require any proof for the existence of God, brecause God is self-existent. He accepts only the Shritis.

The argument based on inference cannot prove the existence of God either by the method of agreement or of difference or by the joint method in the absence of another proof. Again how can God, who is infinite and incomprehensible be proved by finite reason? His existence is to be accepted as an axiomatic truth only on the authority of the scriptures which declare that God is self-existent and He is to be realised by ·knowledge or devotion.

Nature of Ultimate Reality or Supreme God :

It is the distictive character of Indian systems, based upon the Upanaishadas that they are philosophical, religious and theistic. Philosophy unwedded to Religion is purposeless. Similarly Religion without Philosophy is good for nothing; so the philosophical systems founded on the Upanishadas are a mixture of both. Philosophy is concerned with the knowledge of God, the relation of the souls to God, the nature of the world etc. and religion concerns the way for the realisation of God and freedom from worldly bondage. In this sense the Philosophical systems of Shamkara, Ramanuja, Madhava, Bhaskara, Nimbarka and Vallabha are philosophico-religious, though they differ in their conception of Ultimate Reality and the means of realising It.

These philosophical systems are mainly concerned with the problem of evil such as worldly bondage or misery and they mention Work, Knowledge or Devotion as a means for release from it. The Vedanta system of Indian Philosophy concerns itself with the nature of Brahman only. They discuss the natures of individual souls and also the cause of misery. Why do they suffer? Whence are they and why? Who is their ultimate source and why have they been in this world as souls? In their attempt to satisfy the above queries they have discovered that the souls themselves are not independent. They owe their existence to some supreme principle who is the cause of the world and souls—of matter, and life. The souls in their embodied forms as egos forget their real nature and their relation to God and consequently suffer.

As stated previously, Vallabhacharya bases his philosophy mainly upon the Upanishadic texts, supported by the Gita, the Brahma Sutras and the Bhagavata. He has explained fully his concept of God, in two commentaries called the 'Anu Bhashya' on the 'Brahma Sutras', and the 'Subodhini' on the Bhagavata. He also discusses his philosophical concepts of God, the world, the souls and liberation etc. independently. His son Vitthaleshaji and descendants Purushottamaji, Yogi Gopeswaraji, Girdharaji and others have elucidated this philosophy in independent works as well as in their commentaries.

Shri Vallabha is a theistic philosopher. He believes in one God. Various deities are particular aspects or expressions of His reality. God in the Upanishads is known as Brahman, in the Gita as Krishna, Vasudeo or Isvara, and in the Puranas as Parameshvara or Parmatman. Although it is known by these different nanes it signifies the sense of supreme God or Brahman.

According to him, Brahman has three forms : (1) *Svarupa*—Original form (2) *Karana*—as a cause (3) *Karya*—as an effect. As *Svarupa*, it is Purusottama, transcendental or ultimate reality, *Akshara* the immutable one, which is the source of manifestation of *Prakriti* (matter) and Purushas (Souls) and *Antaryamin.* indwelling spiret.

Purushottama as Supreme God :

Again God as *Purushottama* has four forms. (1) *Aksahara*, (2) Time, (3) Action and (4) Nature. *Akshara* is the unmanifested form of God from which the world is manifested from it with the help of the inner power of God called *Maya*. Time is the first principle that is manifested. It disturbs the equilibrium of the *Gunas* (qualities) in the *Prakriti*. The next thing that is manifested in the creative activity is action and then innate nature (*Svabhava*) which is responsible for every kind of change from God. Nature (*Svabhava*) determine the characteristic mark of each thing.

As the material causes must satisfy these conditions (1) Its existence prior to the effect (2) The inherence of the effect in the cause (3) Persistency of the cause in the effect (4) Its inseparability from the effect. The clay is a material case of the jar, because it exists prior to the production of the jar. The jar had its existence in a subtle form of clay, prior to its manifestation as a jar. Clay also persists in the jar even after its production. It is there in the jar-form during its existence and when it ceases to be a jar, it once more returns to its originl form of clay. On the analogy of jar and clay, it is asserted that Brahman is the material cause of the world. The world has come out from Brahman in which it existed as its constituent of 'being.' Only as an effect it is separately known as the world. In other words, the world which is an effect of Brahman, is the effect of Brahman and as such, not different from Brahman. On this point, different systems have different views. The Sankhyas regard *Prakriti* as a material cause. The Vaisheshikas think atoms as a material cause. Shamkara holds that Brahman in its Absolute form is neither a cause nor an effect, but the Maya-conditioned Brahman known as Ishvara is the material cause of world. Ramanuja holds that Brhaman associated with Chit and Achit, is the material cause of the universe. Vallabha shares this view and asserts that the material cause of the world is Brahman alone. It manifests this world by its will, from its 'Being' aspect.

It is also an efficient cause. Badarayana Vyas has considered this in his Brahmasutras.[2] There, it is affirmed that the world, which is unconscious, is the manifestation of God's being aspect and that it is the material cause. The world is not a production but a manifestation, revealed for God's own sport by His Will.

It defines Brahman as one in which the world has existence and to which it ultimately gets dissolved. Not only the origination as 'being' of the world but the subsequent states, namely existence, augmentation, development, decrease and dissolution are also said to be manifestations of Brahman due to God's will. As an effect, it seems to be a separate entity from Brahman but essentially it is not so. In the world which is its 'being' form, Brahman is not lost. It is Brahman without consciousness and bliss. The view of Brahman's being a material cause of the world is supported by the passages of the Upanishadas which affirm 'This whole world is Atman or Brahman'[3] 'This world is Brahman'[4] 'Brahman becomes all'[5] 'Brahman manifests Itself, by Its own will'.[6] The Gita also supports this in VII—6, where Krishna as God says to Arjuna, 'The world originates from Me and dissolves in Me. It further says in VII—7 that there is nothing else besides God. Brahman is the eternal seed of all beings (VII—10).

The Nyaya system recognises three kinds of causes. (1) the Material Cause. (2) the Upadana Cause (3) the efficient Cause. The first one is a material cause. Threads are a material (*Samavayi Karana*) cause of a cloth, but the colour of the threads is the *Upadana Karana.* Vallabhacharya accepts only two causes. He says that Brahman is the Material cause of the Universe and also the Efficient cause. The concept of a *Samavayi Karana* consists in universal and unconditional perversion of God as a cause of the world without being affected in His essence by any change. The concept of *Uprdana* however involves a comcept of a change. While regarding Brahman as a *Samavayi Karana* of the world, Vallabhacharya, however, does not admit that there is *Samvaya* relation between Brahman and the world-which subsists in the case of the relation of a cause and an effect, the whole and its parts, the substance and its quality, because, what is known as an effect or a quality or a part is not different from the cause or a sustance or the whole which is Brahman. He does not understand the *Samavaya* relation as inherence in which it is understood by the Nyaya system but, following Shanmkara and Ramanuja, he understands it in the sense of identity. The manifestation of Brahman in various forms is not different from their cause (Brahman) but they are identical with Brahman. So the relation is to be understood as Tadatmya (identity). This identity is not pure identity but identity involving the notion of identity in difference, in which what appears as different from the cause, is only a different mode of the appearance of the cause. Brahman, according to Vallabhacharya, is unchanging like earth in a pot. Even in Brahman's manifestaion as the world, there is no modification in the essence of Brahman. This is known as *Avikrita Parinamvada.*

The Samkhya system accepts *Prakriti* as a material cause, but it cannot be so; because *Prakriti* is unconscious. It has no will to create. The creative activity presupposes the will on the part of the creator, without which, the world cannot be brought out from *Prakriti* as a material cause. The Vaisheshika atom theory for the same reason is not acceptable. The souls being many and atomic in size, cannuot possess creative activity. So Badrayana says that the creative activity belongs to Brahman, who reevals this world out of Itself for Its own sport, by Its will, uninfluenced by Maya. Vallabhacharya holds the same view.[1]

Brahman is the material cause without *Samvaya* relation (relation of inherence) to the world. According to the Naiyayikas, the relation of inherence exists between a cause and an effect, between a qualities and substance, between universals and particulars. Vallabhacharya does not admit such a relation. Ac-

---

[1] A.B. 1-1-1 to 4.

According to him, Brahman is a substance that manifests Itself, by Its own will, as cause and effect. But the effect is not different from the cause. Only it is known by a new name. The apparent diversity of the objects in fact reveals only one integral Reality—Brahman.

Brahman as Ananda: (Bliss)

Brahman's '(*Sat*) being' constituent is manifested in the world, and 'being' has predominance of (*chit*)consciousness in the soul. Brahman has also the *Ananda* attribute, which is neither manifested in the world, nor in the souls in their embodied forms. The *Ananda* or Joy form of Brahman is described in Brahme Valli of T. U. There Brahman is first described as Truth, knowledge and infinite and afterwards as joy. This joy form is identified with *Anandmaya* 'consisting of joy' or *Ananda* in the same description. It describes Brahman who is the Supreme God with its four *Vibhutis* forms namely *Annamaya* (Physical) *pranamaya* (Vital) *Mamomaya* (Mental) and *Vignanmaya* (Spiritual). These four are understood by Vallabha as cosmos, human souls, the Vedas and Akshara. They are known as *Vibhutis*, Shamkara understands these as physical sheets, but Vallabhacharya following Badarayana takes them as the *Vibhutis* of Supreme God. The Upanishad means to say that the entire world, *Asanya* (vital breath) the Vedas and even *Akasara* are the *Vibhuties* of God. They possess only limited powers of joy. Even *Akasara*, though the source of the world and the souls, is not perfect in joy. Its joy is only limited. It is the Supreme God who is perfect joy. This supreme God is designated first as *Anandmaya* and then as *Ananda*. In the above description *Anandamaya* stands last. It is superior to the preceeding forms of *Ananmaya Pranamaya*, *Manomaya* and *Vignanamaya*. The *Pranamaya* is said to be inner spirit of *Annamaya*, the *Manomaya* of the *Pranamaya*, the *Vignanmaya* of *Mamomaya* and *Anandmaya* of *Vignanamaya*. It is further said that *Anandamaya* pervades these, but there is none other to pervade the *Anandamaya*, excpet its own Ananda. It is in them as their inner spirit. This same Ananda is further described in the same Upanishada as Rasa or Love, figuratively as a bird, withits two wings,—right wing as joy of union with God, and left wing as ecstasy due to agonies of separation from God, and its tail as *Aksahara Brahman*. From this account, it is clear that, according to this Upanishada, the highest conception of *Brahman* is the *Ananda* or love-form. God as *Ananda* or Joy is called *Purushottam* or Krishna. The Geeta also mentions *Puroshottama* as the Highest form of God in Ch. XV, though it is silent there about God's joy-form. Badarayana derives his inspiration for *Anandamaya Brahman* from the Upanishada and regards It as Highest. Vallabha also accepts this as the Highest form. Shamkara, however does reject *Anandamaya Brahman* as highest, though he gives to it a secondary place as *Maya* (Illusion) conditioned God. But Shamkara's view cannot be accepted because it conflicts with Badarayana's view on the following points. (1) It shold be noted that the description of *Brahman* in the above Upanishada ends with *Anandamaya* or *Ananda* which is the highest form of God. (2) Love is to be experienced by the devotee in two states of love i.e. the state of Union and the state of separation. In other words, the highest conception of God is Love. It is superior to Truth and Knowledge-forms of God and this Love-form of God when experienced by the seeker of God by the devotion or love, it will enrapture his heart and fill the soul with extreme joy, making him forget the world and find himself in the presence of God, enabling him to participate in His joy by His grace. This point is illustrated by a metaphorical account of God, as a Swan bird. with Love as its head, emotion of joy as its right wing and excessive ecstasy in separation as the left wing, and *Akshara* (immutable) Brahman as Its tail or foundation or abode. The Ananda is said to be its soul, From this, it is obvious that the highest form of God according to the T.U. is *Rasa*–joy. Badarayan supports—this, in the *Anandamaya Adhikarana* in the first pada, After revealing Brahman's character as Being and Consioousness he describes Brahman as *Anandamaya* or *Ananda* which is superior to *Akshara*. He refers to the objections likely to be raised as under:—

(1) In the above Brahmananda Valli, first of all Brahman is described as *Anandamaya* and then as *Ananada*. If both these are accepted as expressive of Brahman, then there will be a fault of admitting two Brahmans.

(2) The termination "*maya*," affixed to *Ananda* conveys the sense of modification. In the example 'the table made of

wood' the sense implied is that of modification. But Brahman is not subject to modification. So *Anandamaya* cannot be Brahman.

(3) In the description of Brahman as a Swan bird, '*Akshara Brahman* is said to be a tail. This meas that *Brahman* referred to here, is qualified *Brahman* but it is not true. *Brahman* is non-qualified.

(4) If *maya* is used in the sense of "Excess" it means that Brahman has excess of joy and some portion of misery also.

The above objections are ruled out as under:-

(1) The fear of accepting two and Ananda is groundless, because these two words do not mean different Brahmans. They mean one and the same Brahman; because Ananda is not absent from Anandmaya and Anandamaya from Ananda. Both are synonymns—The first describes Brahman adjectively and the second substantively. It is only a different way of describing the same Brahman.

(2) The termination '*Maya*' in *Anandamaya* does not convey the sense of modification. It is not used in the sense of "Made up of", but it is used in the sense of 'excess or fullness'. *Anandamaya Brahman* means Brahman who is full of joy or Perfect Joy.

(3) Although Brahman is said to be a tail, in the description in the above passage, in which *Anandamaya* is compared with a swan bird, it does not convey that the description, there, is of *Savishesha* Qualitied Brahman. This is wrong. Brahman is not NIRVISHESH (Non-qualified) according to the upanisheds. One and the same Brahman is both *Savishesha* and *Nirvishesha* viewec positively and negatively.

(4) The sense of 'Excess' does not convey that Brahman has also misery. 'Excess' means fullness or perfection. Brahman is perfect in joy. One who is perfect in joy cannot have misery. Thus Badarayana establishes the fact that Anandamaya is identical with *Ananda* and these two terms, suggest that God's Highest form is "joy". Vallabhacharya endorses this view of Badarayayana. Shamkara, first of all, supports Badarayana's view, but at the close of the *adhikaran*, changes his position and holds that the *Anandamaya* does not correctly describe the nature of Brahman, which according to him is indeterminate. *Ananadamaya* is applicable

only to determinate Brahman which is due to nescience. It is the work of *Maya* or illusion. This is wrong. To say that the Upnishads teach only indeterminate. Brahman as highest, is misinterpreting them. The Upanishadas do not describe the two kinds of Brahman. They describe one Brahman, only which is determineate. Shamkara puts himself in the wrong box, by supposing two Brahmans—one Principal or Inderterminate Brahman and the other secondary or Determinate Brahman due to the impact of *Maya.* All other Acharyas have rejected this theory of Shamkara. The sense of '*maya*' in *Anandamaya* as fullness does not convey modification of the substance. We do not mean by the jar-sky, that the sky in the jar is its modification or when we say that the pot is full of milk, we do not understand that milk is the modification of the pot. In the same way, it is not true to say that Anandamaya Brahman is a modified Brahman. Ananada-joy pervades all the forms, animate and inanimate-life and matter. It is inherent in them. The Vedas also point to the *Ananada* as Highest Bliss. In human souls it is partially experienced by knowledge and devotion. *Akshara* is the form of Brahman with limited joy. So it is not the highst Brahman. But Brahman as Ananada or *Rasa* is the Supreme Brahman. The *Brahmanand Valli* of T.UP. refers to the nature of Brahman by distinguishing *Akshara* from Purushottama. The nature of Brahman is described there as being Truth, Knowledge and Infinite. The knower is to realise Brahman in his heart. The idea of Supreme joy is conveyed by his enjoyment of Brahman or God, who is "*Joy*". So in this description, first word 'Brahman' is used for *Akshara Brahman.* As it is not the final goal, the seeker of the Supreme God is admonished to realise God in heart through love. Grammatically considerd, *Ananadamaya* is not *Sakara* or qualified Brahman, as understood by Shankara. '*Maya*' no doubt has the sense of modification as in *Kashthamaya*—made of wood, but in *Ghrutamaya*, it means full of Ghee. According to Panini when '*maya*' is affixed to a word having more than two vowels, it conveys the sense of 'excess or fullness'. The words *Annamaya*, *Pranamaya*, *Manomaya*, *Vijnanamaya* and *Ananadamaya* contain more than two vowels, so it is wrong to take *Ananadamaya* in the sense of 'made of *Ananada*'. It only means that it is full of joy. It is Perfect in Joy, without misery.

Brahman as Determinate and Indeterminate:
(*Savishesha* and *Nirvishesha*)

The concept of Brahman is expressed in a single compound word. 'Sat-Chit-Ananada,' in the Upanishadas. It is described as devoid of qualities and as possessed of qualities. Hence the doubt arises, whether Brahman is one or two. The Shriti 'It is only one without a second[1] emphatically asserts that Brahman is one, but Shankara curiously evolves his theory of two Brahman from the Upanishads. He says that one set of the passages, which refers to the qualities of Brahman is descriptive of the Determinate Brahman and the other set in which the qualities are negatived is descriptive of Indeterminate Brahman. He further adds that though the Upanishads mention these two Brahmans, the *Nirvishesha* alone is the Highest, the other is due to *Maya* or illusion. He is of the opinion that unless these two Brahmans are recognised, the Upanishadic texts cannot be trusted. So he propounds the theory of the two Brahmans; but he says that although there are two Brahmans, both are not equal. Only *Nirvishesha* Brahman is the principal, the other one i.e. *Savishesha* Brahman is only secondary, intended only for worship in the initial stage. The aspirant in his advanced stage of knowledge will know the distinction between the two Brahmans. He will then turn from *Savishesha* Brahman, and make *Nirvishesha* Brahman as his goal. The goal of the seeker of spiritual life must be attainment of *Nirvishesha* Brahman or liberation, by the soul merging into It.

Ramanuja believes that one and the same Brahman is described as *Nirvishesha* and *Savishesha*. There are no two Brahmans.

Nimbarka and Vallabhacharya also hold this view. Brahman is one, though it is described as *Nirvishesha* (without qualities and *Savishesha* (possessed of qualities)

The author of the Brahma Sutras has discussed this question in the second pada of the third chapter in the Sutras beginning from 11th to the end of the part.

The following are the chief points considered there.

(1) It is wrong to say, that the Upanishads teach two Brahmans, because in some places Brahman is said to be devoid of quali-

---

[1] ekam eva adviti m.

ties and in other places it is described as having qualities. Both these descriptions refer to one Brahman only. The difference lies in the two different methods of description—Negative and positive. *Nivishesha* means destitute of worldly qualities and *Savishesha* means possessed of transcendental qualities.

(2) The theory of the two Brahmans is vitiated by the fact that the Up. teach that Brahman is one.

(3) The supposed duality of Brahman is an indication of only the dual aspect of Brahman.

(4) If it is argued that the *Savishesha* Brahman is due to illusion, it cannot be accepted because the principle of Maya (illusion) is not admitted anywhere in the Upanishads.

(5) Shankara's theory of two Brahmans falsifies his own position as a Non-dualist.

(6) If there are two Brahmans, with differences between them, then we must know whether the differences are real. If it is asserted that the differences are false, no object will be served by resorting to *Savishesha* Brahman and worshipping it. It is, then not Highest Brahman. Again, it being permanent, even though a secondary one, Its acrtivity as the creator of the world will never cease and consequently the soul will be permanently bound to the worldly state and there will be no release from it.

(7) Even the passages which describe Brahman negatively, do not deny the qualities of Brahman. All that they assert is that Brahman's qualities are such that they cannot be fully comprehended by men with their limited knowledge.

(8) When the Shruti says, "It is beyond speech and therefore It is not like this," it only informs us that it is not within the reach of a man's knowledge. If any one says that he has known Brahman, it is simply his vanity. In fact, he has not known Brahman. Brahman ·is all perfection and cannot be known fully by men, however much advanced they may be in knowledge, because, men, after all, are imperfect beings.

(9) Some passages, give positive and negative descriptions in the same Shruti. For example, the Shriti says, "Brahman has no feet, no hands and yet It runs and grasps things"[1] Here hands

---

[1] Apani pado javano grahita.

and feet are both denied and affirmed in the case of Brahman. So it is obvious that Brahman has dual aspects and both are true. It is not that one part of the Shriti is true and the other wrong. We must accept the whole Shruti as true. Elsewhere it says "Brahman has eyes, hands and feet in all directions."[1] This supports that Brahman is not devoid of qualities or a form.

Badarayana says that, when Brahman is described as without form or qualities, it should be understood that it denies ordinary or worldly form and qualities, and not divine form and qualities. Just as a thing made of sugar, is sugar in all its parts, so Brahman is full of *Ananda* everywhere—in its form and qualities. It is the presence of Ananda, which makes Brahman's form and qualities perfectly divine. So when the Shriti describes the *Savishesha* Brahman we must understand that it speaks of the divine qualities of Brahman. Vallabha holds that Brahman is one, though described as *Nirvishesha* and *Savishesha*, as denying worldly qualities and as affirming only divine qualities respectively.

So the 'Qualified' and 'Non-qualified' are the aspects of the same Brahman, hence there is no contradiction in the Upanishadic passages. This is the view of Badarayana also[2] that Brahman is diestitute of the worldly qualities, as well as is possessed of divine qualities.

In the world, things are circumscribed by time and space and fixed by certain limitations and rules. Brahman has no such limitations, and no rules for the manifestation of its qualities and forms. It can assume any form and exhibit any quality, at any moment, whenever it pleases It. It cannot be judged or measured, in the way we judge or measure worldly things abecause Brahman's form and qualities are divine.

In fact, every word used positively or negatively in describing Brahman, points to some quality on the part of Brahman. So, even when Brahman is described as devoid of qualities, it means that these are the two identical methods, modes or approaches to Brahman. One represents Brahman negatively and the other positively. They are not even two sides of a coin, or light and shade in a picture, but both are one, each is inseparable from the other, according to Vallabhacharya, in different aspects.

---

[1] Visvato Chaksu Vishvate pado.

[1] B. S. 3-2-22.

Brahman as Substratum of Opposite Qualities:

Thus, Brahman is both determinate and indeterminate. It is capable of manifesting itself in every kind of form, because it possesses all powers and all qualities. Bradarayana supports this.[1] Vallabha remarks in his A.B.[2] on 2.1 that[3] all the qualities stated in the Vedas are possible in Brahman, because Brahman is All powerful. That power of being 'All' is possessed by Brahman alone and should not be questioned. It expresses a particular power or quality in a particular form when It wills to do so, and Its will has no definite purpose except Its sport (Lila).[4] Brahman's powers are unthinkable. They are wonderful and varied[5]. In possessing such powers, there is none equal to or superior to It.[6] Brahman possesses all kinds of attributes, but, It does not reveal all of them simultaneously as its prominent characteristic, in each particular object. Thus it manifests only heat in fire and hides attributes like coolness etc. from it. In water it manifests only coolness and hides other attributes. Thus all the various things that we experience are various Kinds of expressions of Brahman's particular attributes. Although one object is different from another, in having that particular attribute, it does not mean that they are different from Brahman. All these objects are fundamentally expressions of Brahman. These differences in the monifestation of the attributes are due to the 'Will' of Brahman, which enjoys the pleasure of Its sport, by differentiation of the objects, each with a distinct attribute. Shamkara explains this differentiation as due to illusion. But Vallabha does not accept that explanation, as it has no support from the scriptures. He believes Brahman as a substratum of all kinds of attributes. It is also a substratum of opposite attributes. If it becomes 'All', It has opposite attributes also because, the word "All" includes the objects of opposite attributes also. Then should we suppose that Brahman is self contradictory? Our reply is 'No'. Brahman is a homogeneous entity, without any contradicton. If is is understoood thoroughly well that Brahman, being All-powerful can manifest Itself in any form It likes, then so called contradictions are also expressions of God. Brahman is Infinite as well as finite. It becomes the Sun with light and the Night with darkness. It is revealed as goodness and wickedness, in beauty and ugliness, in pleasure and pain, in love and hate, in victory and defeat, in smallness and greatness, in joy and grief. The Gita explains the nature of Brahman's being a substratum of contrary attributes.[1] It says that it is personal as well as impersonal. It is devoid of senses and possessed of senses, attributeless and possessor of attributes. It is within and without. It is near and far. It is movable and immovable. It is indivisible and divisible. It is the creator and destroyer, It is a knower, knowable and knowledge. It is immortality and death, being and non-being.[2] This point is touched by Badarayana[3] The contradiction is reconciled by an illustration of a serpent. The serpent when crawling on the ground, assumes a straight form; but when it assumes a sitting posture, it is circular. Both the straightness and circularity are of the same serpent. In the same way, all objects revealing different qualities are expressive of God's forms. Because of their difference in qualities, they are not different from God. Inspite of seeming contradiction of qualities in the world, they are not disharmonious. The rich and the poor, the good and the wicked, the merciful and the cruel, the beautiful, and the ugly, though opposite pairs, are cooperative in establishing harmonious order in God's creation. Differentiation or contrariety in the qualities in the same object or in different objects is due to God's will, for the purpose of God's sport. All the different qualities are like the different musical notes, which are co-operative in producing sweet musical harmony.

---

[1] B. S. 2-1-30 and 2-1-37. [2] B. 5 [3] 2-1-3. [4] B. S. 2-1-53
[5] B. S. 2-1-28. [6] S. Up. 6-8.

Immanence and Transcendence of Brahman:

Vallabhacharya believes Brahman as immanent and transcendental. The Shriti passages—"All this is Brahman".[4] "All this is nothing but Brahman,"[5] Brahman becomes all,"[6] assert Brahman's immanence. In these Shritis' "All" means the world. It means that Brahman is the world and the world is Brahman. In other words, All is God and God is all. In Western philosophy this relation of God to the world as being identical is known as Pantheism, by which word, Spinoza designated his philosophy. This means that there is one absolute spiritual Reality, known as God, which is represented as the world and the souls. According to him, every thing, every event, everymind and mental function are God and nothing else. By 'All this is God' is meant that God is in the world and not beyond it. All the animate and inanimate beings are expressions of God. Pantheism identifies the world with God. Vallabhacharya regards the world as a part of God only. Pantheism does not express the whole truth about God. If God's transcendental nature is not accepted, the infinitude of God will be limited and He will be circumscribed by the limitations of time and space. The scriptures do not accept merely immanence of God, but they also believe that along with God's immanence in the world, He is transcendental. According to Vallabhacharya, the world is only a fragment of God, manifestation of God's 'Being' constituent. Similarly souls are fragments of God's consciousness-constituent. The Gita establishes transcendence of God in X-42, where Krishna says to Arjuna. "I stand holding this entire universe by my small part."[1] Kant and Hegel among the western philosophers, not being satisfied with Spenoza's Pantheism, rejected it and adopted a new term viz. Panentheism believing that all is in God. Instead of saying 'All is God', they say, 'All is in God'. By this, they recognised the transcendental nature of God. Shamkara, Ramanuja and other Hindu Acharyas also believe in the transcendeace of God. Shamkara says that the world has no real existence. but due to illusion it appears real. According to him Brahman is not monifasted in the world. The world is only an appearance. Ramanuja believes that Brahman, as a cause, has become the world—an effect. He explains the relation between Brahman and the world and sonls by the relation of the soul to the body. The world and the souls together constitute the body and God is its soul. Vallabha takes the world as Brahman's 'Being' aspect. It is not complete Brahman, which is Being, Consciousness, and Bliss. So Brahman pervading the world, is only partially manifested there. Brahman in Its fullness is infinitely supeior to the world. Thus he believes God as transcendental, but he says that God is both immanent and transcendental. Both these forms are real and that there is no self-contradiction.

---

[1] Ch. XIII 13-16 [2] Ch. X 19. [3] B. S. 3-2-27
[4] B. U. 3-2-45. [5] C. U. 7-25-2. [6] B. U.-2-4-6.

Transcendence of Brahman is emphasised in S. Up.[2] "Brahman enveloping the whole universe stands by 10 fingers above it."

---

[1] Vistabhyahamidam Krutsnamsena sthito jagate.

[2] S. Up. 3-14.

Akshara and Purushottam:

In several texts of the Upanishads, *Akshara* is used as a synonymn of *Brahman*, but the Upanishads themselves differentiate between *Akshata* and *Purushottama* and say that no doubt Akshara is form of Brahman yet it is not the supreme God or Purushottam. The Gita has specifically expressed its opinion[1] that Purushottam is superior to Akshara. Shamkara on the other hand regards Akshara. as principal Brahman, as It is free from determinations and Purushottama, having a form or personality, is secondary. He regards Purushottama as Maya-conditioned Brahman, only intended for meditation. It is not so according to the Upanishadas and the Gita. Let us first understand how the concept of Purushottama was evolved. In the 10th BK of the *Rigveda*, there is a hymn, known as *Purusha Suktam* in praise of *Purusha* or Supreme God. There the word Purushottama does not occur, but it asserts that in the beginning, prior to creation, there was only one principle, known as *Purusha.* During the Upanishadic stage, the word Brahman was used for God; but then the sages were conscious of the two forms of Brahman—(1) The Immutable or the unmanifest and (2) The Personal or the manifest. The first one was designated by the word 'Akshara' and the second one as '*Para Purusha*' or *Divya Purusha.* This form of Brahman was accepted as higher than Akshara.[2]

The Gita refers to the three Purushas–the perishable world with souls, imperishable Akshara, and Purushottama as Supreme one. termed as Kshara, Akshara, and Purushottama as Suprme. It is the original Purusha of the Rigveda, that in its revolutionary process came to be recognised as Purushottam. The Gita distinguishes Akshara from Purushottam.[3] The following are the chief points of differences between the two.

Akshara	**Purushottama**
1. It is non-manifest. It is impersonal.	1. He becomes manifested by His will in any form. H*b* is personal.
2. It is pervasive everywhere.	2. He is accessible to His seeker only.

---

[1] XV 15 & 16.

[2] K. U. 2-6-8, M. U. 2-2-2, S. U. 3-8, 3-15 and T. U. 2-8

[3] in VIII 21, XII 3-4-5, XIII 30 to 32, and KV 15-16.

Akshara	Purushottama
3. It is attained by knowledge.	3. He is attained through devotion.
4. It is unthinkable.	4. He is thinkable by the devottees.
5. It is immovable.	5. He is movable.
6. It is an abode of Purushottama.	6. He transcends Akshara.
7. It is the origin of Prakriti and Purusha.	7. He is the origin of Akshara.
8. It is finite in Bliss.	8. He is Infinite in bliss.
9. Moksha is the fruit by resorting to Akshara.	9. Moksha is Union with God and participation in His Bliss resorting to Purushottam.

In T.U. 'Akshara' is said to be 'a tail of the Swan Bird of God-who is Ananda. It is also said to be *Pratishtha*—or foundation or support of the Supreme God. The difference between Akshara and Purushottama is explained at great length in Anu Bhashya on B.S.3-3-33 by Vitthalesha, the son of Vallabhacharya. Vallabha has distinguished it from Purushottama or Krishna in his "*Krishna-Ashraya*" and "*Siddhanta-Muktavali*" works. He uses for Akshara the term Brihat and says that it is inferior to Krishna because its bliss is limited, where as, Krishna's bliss in unlimited.

The Categories:

Time, Action, Nature, soul or spirit and Prakriti are the main categories in this system. They are all manifestations of God's forms. The Sankhaya system considers 25 elements, the Vaishesha seven *Padarthas*, and Nyaya sixteen, for the right knowledge to get freedom from the worldly bondage. Vallabhacharya regards the knowledge of Brahman alone as requisite for the union of the souls with God. The main object of his philosophy is not only to point out the way, leading to freedom from the world, but also the way of the soul's union with God. So he conisders only those categories which lead to the knowledge of God. Mere knowledge is not enough for the achievement of the union, unless it is followed by devotion. One cannot turn to devotion unless one comprehends fully, the greatness of God revealed in creation. It is to give an idea of the greatness of God as a creator of the universe with diverse souls for His Sport that he considers the above categories. Supreme God as Purushottama manifests first Time, Action and Nature from Him, and the souls and the world are evolved out from His immutable form–Akshara. These categories are not different from God. They are only specific forms of God, with specific characteristics. Time is the first factor which reveals the universe. Action and Nature are respnosible for the functions and qualities of different beings in the Universe.

Time:

It is a form of God. It involves activity and nature. Its inner nature consists of 'Being, Consciousness and Bliss'. Only its 'Being' part is manifested in the phenomenal world. It is supra-sensible. It is to be cognised only from its effects. It is pervasive and the cause and support of all the things. It is Time, which is the first cause, disturbing the equilibrium of the qualities. It has three forms (1) the Physical namely the sun, the moon etc. (2) the spiritual forms, namely the atoms and (3) the Divine form—God. It is suprasensible and it is inferred from the nature of its effects.

Action:

This is also a form of God. It is manifested in diverse forms. Vallabhacharya does not admit as Dharma and Adharma as separate categories, like the Vaisheshikas, but accepts action as sufficient to account for the fruit. He does not, however, recognise the independence of action. It is dependent upon God. All actions are the forms of God and their fruits are dependnt upon the "Will" of God. It is universal and manifsets itself in diverse forms in different conditions.

Nature:

Nature is admitted as a separate category. It is identical with God. All changes in the world are due to it. It is universal. It is innate in everything. It is a distinctive quality of a thing by which it can be distinguished from other things. It is from *Svabhava*, that 28 categpores, *Sattva*, *Rajas*, *Tamas*, *Prakriti* (matter)

Purusha (Soul), *Mahat*, *ego*, *intellact Ahamkara 5 Tanmatra*, *5 Organs of* knowledge, *5 Organs of action*, mind and five elements have been evolved. The Svabhava being a form of God, these Tattvas are also evolved forms of God. In the "*Siddhanta Muktavali*", Vallabhacharya refers to three aspects of Brahman, on the analogy of the three forms of the Ganges. The Ganges, as a river, is its physical, form, As a a holy place, it is spiritual because it removes sins of the pilgrims and purifies them if they bathe in its waters, with a full knowledge that its waters have purificatory property; and as a goddess, its form is divine. So Brahman has three forms—the world (as physical) Akshara (as spiritual) and Krishna (as Divine). No doubt Akshara is a form of God, but it is inferior to Purushottama or Krishna in Vallabha's system. It is the origin of all created beings and also the abode of Purushottama. God's Akshara frorm is intended for those who seek God through knowledge. It is immutable and, from it, the mutable world is manifested by God's will through the instrumentality of His inherent power called Maya.

Purusha: This is used in the sense of Atman or soul, the object of the notion of 'I'. For His Sport, God evoles various forms from His 'consciousness', which in association with Nature, the conglomeration of the body, vital breath, the senses, the mind and the intellect, does various actions and experiences their fruit in this life. The Purushas are many, through ignorance we know them as different and many. Really speaking, they are various manifestations of God, who is one. As souls, they are parts of God and belong to Him. So all their doings and experiences ultimately are God's.

Nature: It is of two kinds (1) One that causes evolutionary series, and associates with ignorance and (2) the inherent power of God, abiding in Him, and assisting Him in manifesting the world. It is also a nature of God by which He creates the world. It is identical with Brahman. Vallabhacharya's conception of Nature differs from that of the Samkhayas who regard Nature as an independent principle. According to Vallabhacharya Nature is dependent upon Brahman. The Samkhyas do not accept Brahman as an ultimate principle. The Samkhya philosophy has 25·principles (elements) but that of Vallabhacharya has 28. He adds Sattva, Rajas and Tamas to 25 principles of the Samkhya. These three qualities are separate from Nature.

Krishna: Krishna typifies the highest form of God as perfect Love and Bliss. The Gita identifies Him with Purushottama or Vasudeva, who is higher than Akshara (XV-15-16) Ramanuja knows Brahman by the name of Narayana or Vishnu. Although the Name 'Krishna' for God is conspicuous by its absence in the Vedas, it figures very prominently in the Mahabharata and in the Bhagavata. The Gita which is a part of the Mahabharata, identifies Krishna with the Supreme God and the Bhagavata also describes His sports. In all the Vaishnava systems, He is the supreme God. The concept of Krishna is as old as the Rigveda where He is mentioned twice.[1] The Chh. U.[2] also mentions him as a disciple of Ghora Angiras and son of Devakari The Gopal Tapini Upanishad describes Him as the Supreme God. Narayana Upanishada also has reference to Him as God. Vitthalesha considers this question in the Anu Bhashya and establishes his theory that the concept of Krishna dates from the time of the Vedas. He illustrates his theory, by quotations from the Vedic hymns, which describe the sports of Krishna mentioned in the Bhagavata.[3] In *Krishna Ashraya*', Vallabha mentions some reasons why he resorts to Krishna. In '*Antah-Karan Prabodha*,' he says that there is no deity higher than Krishna. Whether Krishna as Supreme God is taught by the Upanishadas is immaterial but it is a fact that although Krishna was raised to the position of man-God in the Mahabharata he figured as Supreme God in the Puranas. It seems that at that time, the word 'Krishna' as the Supreme God was more popular than Brahman. The word Brahman was adopted for the philosophical writing sand Krishna for religious works. The Word 'Krishna' for the Supreme God having been once adopted exercised utmost fascination on the Hindu community, especially on the Vaishnavas so that in all the religions works, Krishna was understood as supreme God.

The following etymological explanations are offered for the word 'Krishna'.

---

[1] (Rig. 1. 116-12 and X-108. [2] III 17-604.

[3] (Anu Bhasya on B. S. 4-2-15 and 4-2-15 with·reference to R. L. 2-24, T. Sanhita 1-3-6.

(1) The word consists of two words '*Krish*' and '*Na*'. '*Krish*' expresses the sense of 'being' and '*Na*' that of 'bliss'. The whole word means Brahman who is ccmponent of 'Being' and 'Bliss'.

2 The root '*Krish*' to draw, added to '*Na*' means 'One who draws the souls unto Him and makes them participate in His bliss'

3 He is known as Krishna because He removes sins or miseries of the souls and blesses them as His own. This meaning is derived from its root '*Krish*' to remove.

4 'Krish' meaning to plough or sow, conveys the sense of one who sows the seeds of men's actions, and grants them their fruits i.e. One who shapes the dsetiny of men and lends them happiness or misery. All these explanations point to the fact that the word 'Krishna' is suggestive of Supreme God. Vallabhacharya takes the word in the first sense. To him, He is the Highest God, not only Being, Consciousness, and Bliss, but perfect Bliss or Love.

He is the Absolute, ultimate Reality. He is called *Bhagavan* because he possesses six glorious attributes viz. Greatness, potentiality, glory, beauty, knowledge and detachment from the world. He is omnipotent, omnipresent and omniscient. Absolute Ananada is His essential character. He is Love, and is to be reached only by love of the devotees. The devotee, who wants to enjoy Krishna's Love, must give up everything for Krishna, make Him alone as His goal and think of Him mentally constantly and live in love of Him.

The Status of the World

The world, according to Vallabhacharya is the manifestation of his Being aspect. It is no doubt an effect of which Brahman is the cause. He understands the world not as a product, but as a manifestation. It is purely the work of God without the help of Illusion, interfering with God. It is God's own work created for His own sport. God brings it out from Himself and withdraws it into Himself, whenever it pleases Him. It is as real as God. Just as a spider brings out a web from within for its own pleasure, and withdraws it back into itself, so does God bring out the world and draws it back. This bringing out and withdrawing in are simply manifestation and non-manifestation and are the two powers that belong to God. During manifestation, different objects with different names and forms are manifested. They are all expressive of God's qualities. The objects like a jar etc. though having different names and forms are God's own work.: God's own qualities are revealed in each one of them. They are, therefore, real. Vallabha's system is known as the system of pure non-dualism, because all things are real and one with God, according to it. Even in their differences, they are one with God. Regarded in this light, not only good things, but bad ones are also expressions of God. In this system, there is no room for error or illusion.

The Samkhya System

The question of relation of the world to God has engaged the attention of philosophers almost in all the philosophical systems. The oldest philosophical system that has considered this subject Samkhya system, which believes that Prakriti is the cause of the world. Let us first consider that system.

The main thought of the Samkhya centres round a list of 25 substances as given below:—

1. The subject (Purusha)
2. The object (Nature)
3. Intelligence
4. Ego
5. The mind.

6–10. Subtle elements of sound, touch, colour, taste, and odour.

11–15. Hearing in ears, touch in skin, seeing in eyes tasting in tongue, and smelling in nose.

16–20. Speaking in tongue, grasping in hands, moving in feet, execrating in Payu, Generating in sex organ.

21–25. Ether, air, fire, water, and earth.

In this system, Nature has got various synonymns such as *Avyakta*, *Pura* (abode) *Dhruva* (unchanging) *Pradhana* (chief) *Akshara* (indestructible). *Kshetra* (field, object) *Tamas* (darkness), and *Prasoota* (productive).

Purusha has no beginning; It is subtle, omnipresent, perceptive, without qualities, eternal seer, experiencer, knower of objects, spotless and non-productive. Its synonyms are *Atman*, *Puman*, *Kshetɹagnas*, *Nara*, *Kavi*, *Brahman*, *Prana*, (anybody) and *Sat*.

These twenty five elements have been grouped into three classes (1) The eight Prakritis (primary and productive elements—Prakriti, Ahmkara and the five Tanmatras (2) The sixteen Vikaras (modifications). The five perceptive organs, five organs of action. The mind and five material elements and (3) The Purush or the spirit.

Principal Doctrines of the Sankhya-System

(1) The Purushas are many. The multiplicity of Purushas is proved from the variety in the acts of pleasure, pain, trouble, confusion, birth and death stages of life and the differences of castes and ranks to which men are born. If there were one Purush, and if one were happy, all would be happy and if one were unhappy, all would be unhappy. But it is never the case. Hence the Purusha is not one; but they are many. Their plurality is eternal and not phenomenal only.

(2) The whole objective universe is real. It is called Nature.

(3) Prakriti by iteslf has no consciousness. When seen by the Purusha, this undeveloped Prakrati, is always operative and passing through a process of evolution.

(4) The seven modifications and forms of Prakriti are all effects and serve as causes also, while the undeveloped Prakriti has no antecedent cause but serves as the original cause only, for all the other forms of Prakriti.

(5) The more the Purusha is in contact with Prakriti, the stronger is the bondage. For the absolute freedom from this bondage, it is the duty of the Purusha to shake the fetters of Prakriti. Dissociation with Prakriti means summum bonum.

(6) There is no need for God.

(7) Prakriti is the material cause of the universe.

The fourth Pada of the 1st chapter of B. S. is devoted to the comments on the various philosophical tenets of the Samkhyas. This sschool regards Prakriti and not Brahman as the material cause of the world and advances the following reasons.

(1) All things in the world are finite. As the finite cannot be the cause of the universe, Prakriti which is infinite must be supposed to be the cause.

(2) All worldly things are capable of producing pleasure, pain and indifference, which arise from the three gunas—Sattva, Rajas and Tamas. One that possesses these three gunas is according to the Samkhya, Prakriti alone. So it should be admitted as a cause of the world.

(3) Without activity, there can arise no effects from the cause. As Prakriti possesses activity which as inherent in it, it must be supposed as a cause.

(4) The world with its multifarious objects is the outer manifestation of that which is implicit in the Prakriti. If it were not implicit, it could not be evolved. So Prakriti should be accepted as the cause of the world.

(5) The unity of the world points to the same theory.

The Purushas, being many, cannot become the cause. The Samkhya claims that their system is based upon the Upanishadas, but this claim is hollow, according to the author of the Brahmasutras, who has criticised the Samkhya theory.[1] Samkara, Ramanuja, Nimbarka, Bhaskara and Vallabha have rejected completely the theory of the causality of Prakriti. The fundamental point of criticism is that the Samkhya does not accept Brahman. No doubt, in some Upanishadic texts, the principles of the Samkhya system are indicated, but these do not lend countenance to their theory of the causality of Prakriti. It is the main point of difference. All the Upanishadas teach Brahman alone as the cause of the world. The Samkhya of the Upanishads is theistic and it is the subject of discourse in the 3rd Book of the Bhagavata, where Kapila, the preacher of the Samkhya system, preaches principles of the Samkhya. The Samkhya of the later times, being materialistic is rejected by all the commentators of the Brahma Sutras. Vallabhacharya also, following them, criticises that system, especially its theory of the causality of Prakriti. The following are the chief points.

---

[1] B. S. 1-1 and II-2.

(1) 25 principles of the Samkhya, supposed to have been mentioned in the Upanishadas, bear meanings quite different from those understood in the Samkhya system, for example —*Avyakta* does not mean Prakraiti but *Brahman.* Kapila is not the name of a sage, but suggests the sense of Brahman. *Aja* is not Prakriti, but light. The words, "*Panch Pancha Janah*" do not mean 25 principles, but five tendencies of the intellect. Prakriti is not Matter, but Brahman as a material cause. From this it is obvious that the Upanishadic texts have been wrongly interpreted by the Samkhya system.

(2) Ultimate Reality is Brahman and not Prakriti and the Purushas. They are eminations from Brahman.

(3) Prakriti and Purushas are not independent, but represent two aspects of Brahman—Prakriti-'being' aspect and Purushas or 'souls, the consciousness' axpect.

(4) Prakriti and Purushas cannot be accepted as absolute and independent. In that case there will be no contact between them and no creation according to the Samkhya system.

(5) Prakriti, being unconscious, according to the Sankhya, cannot create the world. Creation needs a creator who is intelligent. Again the harmony, order and design, revealed by the world, are impossible without an intelligent and conscious principle.

(6) The argument that Prakriti creates the world for Purusha is not acceptable on the analogy of the illustration, namely, that just as milk comes out from the udder of the cow for the nourishment of the calf so Prakriti creates the world for the Purusha. The example, cited, has no bearing as Milk of the cow from its udder is the milk of a living cow, a conscious being, Prakriti is not a conscious principle.

(7) There is no reason in supposing that Prakriti is working for the Purusha. If Prakriti is absolute, why should it work for Purusha?

(8) It is also wrong to argue that Prakriti is active and Purusha is passive. He simply enjoys the happiness or misery—the results of Prakriti's work. No man, with common sense, will believe this. The law of action is that the agent of the work is liable to the enjoyment of the fruits.

(9) According to the Samkhya, the Purusha, being always in juxtaposition with Prakriti, there will be no release from worldly bondage for him.

(10) If the Samkhya conceives that they work like a blind and a lame man, helping each other in their journey to a common destination, it is not worthy of acceptance, because Prakriti is un conscious and unintelligent, while Purusha intelligent and indifferent. Co-operation is possible only in the case of persons with common pointsbetween them. How is it possible, in the case of beings that are of opposite natures?

Vallabhacharya rejects the Samkhya theory on these grounds and believes that Brahman alone is the material cause.

Sat Karya Vada

Although Vallabhacharya criticises the Samkhya theory of the causalty, he accepts its theory of the *SatKarya Vada*, which affirms that every effect has its pre-existence in the cause. In support of this theory, the following five reasons are given:—

(1) The thing which is an effect must have its existence in the casual form; otherwise it would not be produced. Unless a jar has existence in clay. it cannot appear as a jar.

(2) The effect is nothing but a manifestation of the material cause, because it inheres in the effect. Earth which is a material cause of a jar is invariably connected with it. Even in the effect state of a jar, earth as a cause persists in it. If there is no earth, then there is no jar.

(3) Unless, the effect potentially exists in the cause, it cannot appear with its specific potentially. If it were not so, anything would come out from anything. Curds will be produced from water. The peculiarity in the effect is latent in the cause, and when the effect is produced, its peculiarity is also produced along with it.

(4) Everything cannot be produced from everything; only that will be produced from the effect, which is latent in the cause.

(5) In fact, an effect is the essence of its material cause and as such they are identical, only the effect was implicit in the cause became explicit. It is essentially both cause and effect, and both these are real. Shamkara who accepts the theory of *Vivarta Vada* (illusion) rejects this; but Vallabhacharya agrees

with the general fact of the theory. His main difference with the Samkhya theory of *SatKKarya-Vad* is that though it is correct in principle, is wrong in application to Prakriti.

It should be borne in mind that Vallabhacharya's criticism of the Samkhya is directed against the later Samkhya which is represented in the Samkhya Karikas of Ishvarachandra. The original Samkhya attributed to Kapil was theistic, and non-dualistic. The Samkhya in the Mahabharata and the Gita is also theistic. The Bhagavata gives to Katpila the dignity of God's incarnation. The later Samkhya of Ishvarachandra taught dualism of Prakriti and Purusha. It did not accept Brahman as an ultimate principle. It was agnostic rather than atheistic. The author of the Brahma Sutras criticises this agnostic Samkhya. Vallabhacharya however agrees with the later Samkhya in its two main tenets (1) Realism of the world and (2) Plurality of the souls. The chief points of criticism of the Samkhya are enumerated above.

Chief reasons of Vallabhacharya's opposition to the Samkhya are:—(1) It does not recognise God, as an ultimate principle. It is a God-less system. (2) It is pessimistic as it lays stress on the theme of misery of life and, as a means of escape, on cessation from work (3) It does not accept the authority of the Vedas (4) It accepts 25 principles; whereas according to Vallabhacharya there are 28 principles. (5) It fails to explain how the unconscious Prakriti can create the world. (6) It also cannot satisfy our inquiry as to how the two principles—Prakriti and Purusha of opposite nature can coalesce with each other (7) It gives a wrong view of life that a man must be devoted to knowledge only and refrain himself from doing any work (8) The teleological conception of Prakriti is inconsistent with its unconscious and unintelligent (9) It is illogical to believe that intelligence is evolved from Prakriti which is un intelligent nature (10) Its theory that Prakriti is 'a Doer', Agent' and the Purusha, 'an enjoyer' fails to impress us. It is faulty logic. The Law of action says, that it is the doer of an action, who enjoys the fruit of his actions. Samkhya theory does not throw any light as to how Prakriti and Purusha came into existence,—if not from God.

The Nyaya-Vaisheshika Theory of the World

Like the Samkhya school, the Nyaya and Vaisheshika Schools become subjects of criticism in the Brahma Sutras.

These two schools accept 'atoms' as the material cause of the world. They accept God as an efficient cause. The Nyaya Vaisheshikas advocate the theory of non-existence of an effect in the cause, which is opposed to the Sat-Karya-Vada of the Samkhya. They believe that the effect does not exist in the cause.

As the effect is simply something new, which is not in the original cause; it is not real. This is also known as *Arambhavada*' or *Paramanukaranrvada*'. The Paramanus are infinitely small, indivisible, partless and eternal particles of matter. All material objects of the world are composed of them. When they combine in a particular way, particular objects are produced and when they are separated, they are destroyed. These atoms, being eternal. are neither produced nor destroyed, but their combinations are produced and destroyed. There are four atoms viz. those of earth, water, fire, and air. Ether or sky is not atomic, but it affords the medium for combination and separation of the atoms. They differ from eadr other both quantitatively and qualitatively. The unseen power 'imparts motion to them, and they begin to vibrate and change—Two atoms into *dyads* or combination of two and three *dyads* into a *Triad* and four into a quartrad and so on. An atom is indivisible, spherical and imperceptible. A dryad is minute, short and imperceptible.

This atomic theory is accepted by the author of the Brahma Sutras. Vallabhacharya also rejects it on the following grounds.

(1) Combination of atoms into dayads is not possible because the atoms are spaceless. Two atoms cannot combine, so the combination by conjunction is also not possible.

(3) Nor is the combination by inherence possible, because the relation of inherence subsists between a cause and an effect, a substance and its quality, and the whole and its part, but the supposed combination of the atoms is not so. The dyad is not a part, a quality or an effect of the atoms. The atoms are supposed to be partless.

(4) If the atoms are eternal, then the creation will be permanent There will be no destruction. But it is not so. The destruction of the world is a fact.

(5) If the atoms have form, they are not eternal.

(6) It is not true that there are qualitative differences among the atoms: in that case their weight and magnitude will differ.

(7) If the atoms possess quality like smallness, how can they be eternal?

(8) If the qualities inherent in the cause pass into ffect, the qualities of atoms, must pass into dryds or and those of the dryds into triads and so on, but it does not so happen.

(9) If the atoms play an active role in the creation, then the creation will be permanent. If they are both permanent and non-permanent, then it is contradiction.

(10) Vaisheshikas' concept of God as an efficient cause is without activity and power and hence good for nothing.

(11) In combination of the atoms, one in contract with another will be a big one, and not short and if one is behind the other, it will be a long one and not spherical as supposed by them.

(12) By accepting God as an efficient cause, He will be open to the charge of ruthlessness and impartiality.

(13) If it is said that God rewards fruits according to the actions of men, then why should one believe in God? God is not necessary because action alone gives the fruit. Such a God will be dependent upon action.

(14) If God is supposed as an efficient cause, only a doer, it is not correct. A doer or a maker must have a body, but God has no body. If it is said that God has a body, then it will not be eternal.

(15) If it is argued that God creates by His Will, it is not convincing. Will or Wish presupposes body. By positing will, we have to suppose God as possessed of the organs and also as an enjoyer of happiness and misery. This will reduce God to the position of the embodied soul. So the atomic theory is defective in every respect.

Buddhism

The Buddhists do not believe in any ultimate principle.

There are four schools among them.

(1) The nihilists believe that everything is void or unreal. (2) The Vaibhasikas believe in the reality of the external objects. (3) The

Sautrantikas hold that external objects are inferrable through cognition. (4) The *Vijnanvadıns* opine that thought (consciousness) alone is real. The last school thinks that at the back of the world, there is only consciousness, and that alone is real.

The Shuddhadvaita School does not give much importance to the Buddhists, because they do not accept the authority of the Vedas and the concept of Brahman. Even Shamkara, who is influenced by Buddhism in his promulgation of nescience theory and who is nicknamed by his opponents as 'Buddha in disguise,' for his doctrine of Indeterminate Brahman and unreality of the world and individual selves, has criticised Buddhism vehemently.

(1) Buddhism in general does not believe in Brahman as ultimate Reality. The *Shunyavadins,* describe it as void and leave the question there. The *Vijnanvadins* consider consciousness as ultimate Reality. Vallabhacharya believes that the ultimate Reality is Brahman. It is Being, Consciousness and Bliss.

(2) The doctrine of nescience propounded by Buddhists is not supported by the Upanishads and other ·scriptures. Vallabha considers nescience like knowledge, as a power of God.

(3) Buddhism finds the world full of misery and shows the way of escape from misery by being free from desires.

In Vallabha's system, there is no room for misery, the so called misery is due to God's will.. It shows the way, not only for escape from worldly bondage but for attainment of the bliss of God.

(4) Buddhism is pessimistic. Vallabha's system is optimistic, for, it asserts that everything happens in accordance with the will of God.

(5) Buddhism does not accept the Upanishadic idea of the unity of Brahman. Vallabha makes it a fundamental principle of his system and indicates the way of realising that unity.

(6) Buddhism regards soul as perishable. Vallabha identifies it with consciousness, a constituent of Brahman, and which is eternal and imperishable.

(7) Buddhism relies upon the doctrine of momentariness and says that all things are subject to a change. A thing which we see at this moment in a particular state, is not the same, another

moment. This process of change in all things is constant. Vallabha does not accept this doctrine of momentariness. There is a change, but it is not modification. It does not affect the thing. The thing has its existence, until its destruction. It is not different at different moments. The chair, prepared ten years ago, is the same chair, even when seen today, and if it is taken care of, it will be the same after some years more. It is ludicrous to hold that the physical objects have momentary existence. Their existence is fairly long. The things existed in Brahman, even before their manifestation. In the present state, they have their existence, in a particular form and in future, even if they disappear, they will have existence in another form without affecting their existence in their changed condition. In all these changes, they do exist.

(8) Buddhism considers souls as series of fleeting ideas. To Vallabha, the souls are fragments representing consciousness of Brahman.

(9) The Buddhists hold that the external world arises out of four kinds of atoms-of earth, water, fire, and air, and the inward world out of five groups of sensations, knowledge, feelings, verbal knowledge and dispositions. Their theory further states that the combination of the physical atoms with the five groups of the *Skandhas*, is the cause of the worldly bondage of the soul. But as the author of the Brahma Sutras says[1]. "There is no probability even in the least, for this combination, because the atoms are unintelligent and the *Skandhas* are momentary. The act of combination cannot be finished in one moment. First the souls should be produced, then the atoms and the Skandhas should combine and then the combination takes place. This process cannot be completed in one moment. If it is asserted, that the combination is possible, as, each preceding stage is the cause of the subsequent change, it only explains how the change is originated; and not the combination of the atoms and the Skandhas.

(10) Buddhism accepts the theory of momentarienss; yet, at the same time, it asserts that the mind and its states arise on account of four causes—(1) material cause, (2) impression, (3) senses,

---

[1] B. S. II 2-19

and (4) an auxiliary cause. But this theory cannot be accepted. If the first one is accepted, then, the second one must be given up.

(11) Adherents of the theory of momentariness think that production and destruction happen in the same moment. This is not acceptable. If production and destruction are the nature of a thing, then they will be *synonymns.* If it is said that they are different from a thing, we have to suppose that production is the beginning, existence of a thing is the middle and destruction is its end. This means that the same thing is connected with three moments. This is inconsistent with the theory of momentariness. If it is held that production and destruction are two different things. then they will be permanent and will not be momentary.

(12) The Buddhists maintain that process of universal destruction goes on unceasingly. This destruction is of two types—first, an intellectual or a voluntary act of the mind, as, when one smashes a jar by his own will and the other kind of destruction which is caused by the material decay of things in a natural course. But this is in the series of things as a whole or to the things themselves. As the members in the first case are connected together as cause and effect in an inseparable way, the intellectual or voluntary destruction is not possible, because the continuity of the thing persists even in succeeding moments.

(13) If it is held that nescience is destroyed by perfect knowledge and the righteous conduct, we reject it and assert that destruction takes place without a cause.

(14) The Buddhists believe the soul to be momentary. If it is so, then all discussions about the bondage of the soul and its liberation is merely a fiction and will lead to the position of uncertainty of fixing moral responsibility for the actions of the individuals.

(15) The fact that our memory retains the impressions of the past experience, which can be utilised by us in the present as well as in the future, is a sufficient proof that there exists a permanent synthesizing subject without whom there can be no knowledge.

(16) Vijnanvada believes that, there is only consciousness and the things as separate objects do not exist. This is opposed to the experience of all men and women. If objects like jars, cloth, etc. have no real existence, then how is it that they are perceived and

cognised by us as such? Because we think that a jar has a real existence, we use it for fetching water. If it it not so, no body will wish to have it. So there is no point in saying that they are unreal. They cannot be compared with dream phenomena which in the waking state are not experienced as existing things The worldly objects have existence at all times.

(17) The Vijnanvada believes that the variety of ideas is due to the variety of mental impressions without any reference to external objects. But how can the existence of mental impressions be possible without perception of external objects? First, there are external objects, then there is perception and then, the mental impressions. Without external objects, no cognition can arise. Again, even in the absence of impressions, we believe in the existence of the external world. The imUressions must have some substratum, but it is not accepted by Vijnanvada—because their Alaya-Vijnan suffers from a defect of momentariness.

(18) The Buddhistic philosophy is non-vedic. It has been repudiated by all the Hindu Acharyas. It has many philosophical schools and a vast literature. This philosophy is based upon oral teachings of Buddha. Buddha was more of an ethical teacher and a social reformer than a philosopher. He thought that peace and not philosophy would conduce to good. Ramanuja and Vallabhacharya have rejected it completely because they find no common agreement with that philosophy.

(19) It negatives the idea of God, and is Non-vedic. It says that the ultimate Reality is *Saunya* or *Vijnana.* Both these views are opposed to the Vedic concept of God.

(20) It takes a pessimistic view of the world by saying that everything is unreal. Even the self is unreal and there is misery everywhere. Nothing is permanent in this world and no one is happy.

(21) It accounts all suffering as due to ignorance but the remedy it offers is negative.

(22) It teaches *Nirvana* as the final goal of supiritual life, but he means by *Nirvana,* extinction of desires which is not positive bliss and which is psychologically impossible to attain by common mass of men.

(23) It identifies the soul with ego and says that, it is ultimately unreal. It is described as an aggregate of the body, the sensations and the ideas.

(24) Its theory of momentariness is inconsistent with ethical life and also with spiritual experience of empirical life. It will not be of any use in solving the practical problems of life.

(25) Its theory of the *Sunyavada* does not inspire us for leading spiritual life even if we understand the word 'Shunya' not in the sense of an 'empty', 'void' but as 'indescribable'. In that sense also it retains its negative nature; because it fails to give any positive interpretation of Reality.

(26) Even the *Vijnanvada* is in no way a better explanation of the Reality. It is all abstract and denies the reality of the world and the individual 'selves'.

(27) The concept of Reality as pure consciousness is opposed to the Upanishadic teaching of Brahman.

Vallabhacharya, however, respects Buddha's personality by giving it the dignity of God's incarnation. He believes that under God's will, for some reasons, suitable to God's plan under the circumstances of the times, he had to preach truths, though antagonistic to the Vedas. The historical reason is that the Vedic religion had fallen from its pristine glory, due to the lethargy of the Brahmanical class, which was supposed to be the custodians of the Vedas. In the name of a sacrifice, animals were killed and offered to the gods for propitiation. This made Buddha revolt against the Vedic authority. In his zeal of purifying life and reforming the society, he went to the extreme point of ignoring the fundamental principle of God in the Vedas.

The Mimansa School

The Purva Mimansa School represented by Jaimini is a distinct school of philosophy teaching the doctrine of sacrifice and rituals. It is a Vedic school, but it accepts only the Purva Kanda of the Vedas, the Samhita and the Brahmanas which deal with rituals, as a means of religiouus life. Jaimini puts his views of this school in the sutras (aphoristic sentences) in twelve chapters. This work was explained subsequently by Shabarasvamin and also by Prabhakara and Kumarila Bhatta. Vallabhacharya accepts the

Mimansa philosophy of Jaimini regarding the nature of religion, but differs from him in other respects. He regards Jaimini Bhasya and Badarayana's Brahma Sutras as complementary of each other—the first emphasising the significance of the action-aspect and the latter the significance of the knowledge-aspect of the Vedas. For understanding the truths of the Vedas, both these should be studied. The study of one is incomplete without the study of the other. To explain his views, Vallabhacharya wrote his commentary on the Jaimini Sutras. Unfortunately it is incomplete. He also clarified the Mimansa point of view of religion in his small work' '*Patravalambana*' and the second part of his '*Tattvadipanibandha*' entitled 'Sarva Nirnaya' The fundamental points of difference according to Vallabhacharya from that school are (1) It accepts, the authority of the Vedas as Testimony, but it accepts only the Purvakanda and not the Uttarkanda or the Upanishadas. (2) It does not believe in God. Sacrifice is all in all, serving the God-idea, according to it. (3) It teaches the sacrifice or rituals as a means of religious life and does not accept Knowledge and Devoyion.

(4) No doubt, it regards knowledge as self-luminous, it does not think it as a power or an attribute of God.

(5) It says that the performance of the sacrifices paves the way for the attainment of heavenly happiness but this is not eternal bliss. It is only temporary, until the exhaustion of one's merits, after which, according to the Gita, the soul returns to this world for a new birth.

(6) It introduces the '*Apurva*' between an action and its fruit, but it is ignorant of the Upanishadic teaching that the action was first revealed by God without Apurva.

(7) It believes in the plurality of the souls, but as there is no God as an ultimate principle, there is no relation between the souls and God. Again it says that the souls are ubiquitous (*Vibhus*), but the Upanishadas, the Gita and the Brahma-sutras declare that they are atomic and infinitely small.

(8) Consciousness is regarded by it, only as an accidental quality of the soul. This is also opposed to the Upanishadas which make it an essential quality of the soul.

(9) For knowledge, the Mimansa school accepts three proofs—Perception, Inference and Testimony, but Vallabhacharya accepts only the Holy scriptures.

(10) Erroneous knowledge is explained by Kumarila as what is known as *Viparita Khyati* or *Anyatha Khyati*, which informs us that wrong knowledge of silver in a nacre, is due to a wrong synthesis of the presented and the represented objects i.e. Silver is confused with a nacre. In fact they are both separately real and only their synthesis is unreal. Vallabhacharya holds that there is nothing like error. Even what is called an error is real.

(11) The earlier Mimansa school said that the purpose of the rituals is the attainment of heaven. The later Mimansakas substituted the ideal of liberation in place of the heaven. But it signifies only the state of dissolution of the soul from the body and senses, by abstinence from work. It is only a state of freedom from pains and desires. Even this idea of liberation does not commend itself to us. It is not supported by the Upanishads and the Gita.

(12) The Mimansa view of action is narrow. It is restricted to the sacrifice, only, but the Gita, in chapters III and IV widens its scope and includes under it all kinds of activities, physical, psychical moral and spiritual also. It is also used in the sense of duty. The truths of the Mimansa school are partial and considered narrow. by place for emotion or intellect in the kind of religious There is no life taughtby it, and it does not accept God as an ultimate principle. So, Vallabhacharya does not give importance to it as a trustworthy philosophy.

Jainism:

Jainism does not believe in God, nor does it believe in the authority of the Vedas. Matter and spirit are regarded in that system as separate and independent realities. The souls and the atoms are many. The mataphysics of the Jainas is called *Syad Vada*. which asserts that all knowledge is relative depending upon substance, space, time and form. A thing is existent or non-existent according to the stand point from which it is viewed. This theory is expressed in seven forms of judgments (1) Relatively a thing is real (2) Relatively, a thing is unreal (3) Relatively, a thing is both real and unreal. (4) Relatively, a thing is indescribable. (5) Relatively, a thing is real and is indescribable. (6) Relatively, a thing is unreal and is indescribable. (7) Relatively a thing is real, unreal and indescribable.

This is also known as "*Saptabhangi-naya.*

The Shuddhadvaita does not accept Jain view of knowledge because:-

(1) It does not accept the authority of the Vedas.

(2) It does not believe in God, as the creator of the universe.

(3) It is pluralistic metaphysics. The Upanishadic metaphysics suppoerts Non-dualism and oneness of ultimate Reality.

(4) Its doctrine of probability of knowledge does not give definite knowledge.

(5) To say that one thing exists, and it does not exist at the same time is opposed to our common experience. When we say that the chair is, we mean positively that it has existence. Knowl edge found on probability cannot be useful in life.

(6) It is not true that the judgments are indescribable, because every judgment to be such has to be expressed in words.

(7) To say that knowledge is relative is incorrect; because without the Absolute, relativity cannot be sustained, but Jainism rejects the Absolute principle.

(8) Jainism believes that the size of the soul varies according to the body in which it resides. This means that the soul is small in an ants' body, and big in an elephant's body, but the size of the soul does not depend upon the body. The souls are really small in all the bodies.

(9) If it is maintained that the souls have expansion and contraction, then they must be believed to be subject to modifications. But the soul lodged in the body is unaffected by the modifications of the body.

(10) In the absence of God as a controller of the souls, there is none to keep them in order, the souls will behave arbitrarily. This central ruling authority of God is absent in Jainism.

Mayavada—The Theory of Illusion:

Shamkaracharya is well known for his doctrine of illusion. In his opinion, the world is due to Maya. It is not the work of Indeterminate Brahman but of Maya conditioned-Isvara or the

Determinate Brahman. Although Brahman is real, the world is unreal, only a phenomenol appearance.

Maya Theory:

According to Shamkara, Brahman as taught by the Upanishadas is Indeterminate Brahman though the Vedic passages, describe It both as Indeterminate and Determinate. Reconciliation of these passages of opposite nature was a great problem to Shamkara. Should we believe that the Upanishads really teach two Brahmans? If Brahman is one, how can the descriptions of the two Brahmans be accounted for? If *Nirvishesha* Brahman alone is ultimate Reality, then why should the Shritis describe *Savisesha Brahman*? Should we reject the Shritis pertaining to that? If we reject *Savivesha Brahman,* that means we accept only one kind of the Shritis in favour of *Nirvishashtaone.* Only if the Upanishads are to be accepted as authoritative in the matter of the knowledge of Brahman, the entire body of the Upanishads should be accepted without splitting them into two parts. In that puzzling state, he propounded his Mayat heory to account for the origination of the world from Maya—conditioned or *Savishesha Brahman.* The word Maya has various synonyms such as *Avidya, Agnana, Vivarta, Avyakta, Nama-Rupa, Adhyaropa, Mulprakrati, Bhrama* etc. Originally *Maya* and *Avidya* were not different, but later on, the two terms were differentiated, by the followers of Shamkara. It is a principle having two aspects of Concealment and Projection. It conceals the real nature of Brahman and projects it into the world and the human souls. Shamakra himself treats Maya or Avidya as one. Maya however means illusion, and Avidya, ignorance, absence of knowledge. The following are the chief characteristics of the Maya or Avidya, according to Shamkara. (1) It is beginningless. (2) It is indescribable. (3) It is conscious. (4) It acts as a medium of the projection of the world. (5) It is positive, with two aspects of concealment and projection. (6) It has only a phenomenal and relative character. (7) Its nature is to generate super-imposition of one thing upon another. (8) It can be removed only by right knowledge. (9) Although Brahman is its locus and an object, Brahman is not affected by it just as a magician is not affected by his own magic.

The world is denounced by Shamkara as unreal, like mirage-water, arope-snake, shell-silver, plantain-trunk, a dream, abubble, illusion of double moon, pure magic etc.

This Maya theory of Shamkara has been severely criticised by Bhaskara, Ramanuja, Vallabha, Madhva and other Acharyas. They have challenged Shamkara's Mayavada and asserted that it has no support from the Upanishads. In their opinion, Shamkara's Maya theory is the re-orientation of the Avidya theory of the Buddhists and the Ajativada of Gauda Padacharya from whom he had studied the Upanishads and the Brahma Sutras. Whatever may be the truth, the fact remains that his Maya theory did not find favour with other Bhasyakaras, who were founders of philosophical systems, based upon the Upanishads and the Brahmasutras. They all opposed Shamkara, tooth and nail in this respect. though his disciples like Sureshvaracharya Vachaspati took immense pains in advocating and preaching it.

The first Acharya who took cudgels in dispute for refuting the Maya theory was Bhaskaracharya (A.D. 1000). He sponsored Bhedabhaedavada. His commentary on the Brahma Sutras is a criticism of Shamkara's Mayavada. He charges Shamkara, to have followed Buddhism in preaching Maya Vada. He finds fault with his theory by saying that if Maya is beginningless and endless, there can be no liberation. It cannot be said to be existent and non-existent simultaneously. That is contradiction of terms. Again a non-existent entity cannot cause bondage. If it is existent, we must accept dualism. Bhaskara believes that Brahman is the cause of the universe. According to him, Brahman has two powers, (1) the power by which It transforms Itself into individual souls, and (2) the power by which it transforms Itself into the world. He is the first Acharya to attempt the refutation of Shamkara's Maya Vada.

Ramanuja flourished in the twelfth century. He examines Shamkara's theory in his commentary on the Brahma Sutras. He is an exponent of *Vishishtadvaita.* He finds the Maya theory defective, in reconciling the Upanishadic passages, which describe Brahman both as *Nirvishesha* and *Savishesha.* There is, no doubt, he uses the word Maya, but he takes it in the sense of 'wonderful power of God', and not in the sense of 'illusion', as understood by Shamkara. He admits that ignorance is the cause of bondage and that one can get liberation by means of immediate intuitive knowledge, but his meanings of knowledge, ignorance and liberation are different from those of Shamkara. He believew Brahman as a material and efficient cause of the world and the souls. The relation between Brahman and the world is like that of the soul and the body. The world and the souls constitute God's body. Or the relation is like that of a substantive and its adjectives. The world and the souls are attributes of God. The world is the '*Achit*' attribute and the souls, the *Chit* attribute. These attributes are inseparable from God. They are there, with God in the causal state and are manifested in the effect state. In both the states, they are inseparable. God, who is Brahman, brings out the world from Himself, and by Himself alone, and by means of His wonderful power known as Maya. Since the world is God's own creation, it cannot be unreal. He finds fault with Shamkara's Maya theory as under:

(1) Avidya is ignorance. It is the opposite of knowledge. If Brahman is knowledge, how can ignorance exist in Brahman? So Shamkara is wrong in saying that it has locus in Brahman.

(2) Avidya cannot conceal Brahman. If it does so, then Brahman is not self-conscious and self-luminous.

(3) Shamkara tries to describe the nature of Avidya, but it cannot be described. If it is said that it is positive, it is wrong to speak of it as absence of knowledge. Again if it is positive, it cannot be destroyed. It cannot be both, as, that will be contradiction of terms.

(4) Shamkara is not right in saying that Avidya is indescribable. Even the very word, 'indescribable' is descriptive of it.

(5) It is not known by any proof, such as perception or inference. Even the scriptures do not maintain it.

(6) Shamkara says that knowledge of indeterminate Brahman removes ignorance. This also cannot be accepted. Such knowledge is impossible. There can be no knowledge without discrimination and determination.

(7) As Avidya is positive, according to Shamkara, it cannot be removed by knowledge. If it is absence of knowledge, then and then only knowledge can remove it.

Ramanuja's, follower Venkatanatha known as Vedantadeshika, has given a complete blow to to sixty six charges.[1]

Ramanuja was succeeded by Vallabhacharya. He supported Ramanuja in his repudiation of Shamkara's Maya The wory. Vallabhacharya was a strong believer in Brahman as a material as well as efficient cause of the world. He takes Maya in the sense of 'God's power' which serves as an instrument in the revelation of the world from God. It has inherent potentiality of being manifested in all kinds of forms. It is dependent upon God's will. It is not illusion. As a power of God, it has three functions (1) to conceal God's pervasive character (2) to manifest the world and the souls from God and (3) to give them distinct names and forms ,so that the world and the souls, though (portions) of God, are known as separate entities. Maya performs this function for the lila (sport) of God, by God's Will. Vallabhacharya has rejected Shamkara's Maya theory in toto in his "Tattva Dipa Nibandha' Part I-25-'26 and 39, 40. Vitthaleshji and Purusottamji have refuted this theory in their works 'Vidvan Mandana' and 'Prasthana Ratnakara' respectively. The main reasons for rejecting this theory, which understands Maya, on as error or illusion are briefly indicated as under:

(1) It is opposed to the Upanishadas, which declare Brahman as the cause of the world.

(2) It is opposed to the Gita, which in Chapters VII and VIII emphatically declares God or Brahman as the cause of the world.

(3) The Gita[2] denounces those who think the world as unreal and Godless, as demons.

(4) Shamkara is ignorant of the fact that the scriptures refer to six kinds of the worlds inclusive of the world of illusion, which is given much importance by him. They are: — (1) One created by God Himself[3] (2) the other created through Purusha[4] (3) The third is created in the manner indicated in the Pancharatra through Vasudeo (4) The world for God's elect souls intended for their enmjoyment of God's Bliss is the fourth and (5) the fifth Creation

---

[1] The reader is recommended to consult the work 'Advaita and Vasishadvaita' by S. M. Srinivasa Chari.

[2] Ch. XVI 8 [3] M. U. 2-2-3 A. U. [4] Bhagavat 3-5-26.

by veolutionary process. The sixth is the Illusory world. All thes in the Puranas. (6) The aim of the illusory world is to generate disgust for the world, in the minds of saintly persons, if they are attached to the worldly pleasures believing them as true happiness. Shamkara has taken cognisance of only the last kind of the world which is mentioned in the Puranas and not in the Upanishadas, the Gita and the Brahmaysutras. The Upanishadas are conspicuous by its absence, though the word Avidya occurs there; but it is used in the sense of 'ignorance' and not in the sense of 'illusion'. In *Isavasya Up.* Avidya is referred to, in the sense of sacrifices. There the word '*Sambhuti*' has been used as the cause of the world, but it does not carry the sense of Maya as 'illusion' but of Prakriti or Brahman as a material cause; Katha and Mundaka mention Avidya, but, with a view to differentiating it from Vidya. It does not convey the sense of Maya. Even *Taittiriya*, *Chhandogya* and *Brihadaranyaka* are silent about Maya. The only Upanishad, which mentions it is the *Svetasvatara*, but it understands by it 'the power of God', and, as that power is absolutely under the control of Brahman, It is said to be Mayin (Master of Maya).

(7) The Brahma Sutras should have considered the Maya theory, if it were taught by the Upanishadas, but there is no reference to it, in any part of the Brahma Sutras ,except in III 2-3. The proper place for the consideration of this principle is chapter II, where various schools opposed to Brahma Vada are refuted In III, 2-3. the word occurs in a compound form as "*Mayamatram*" with reference to dream phenomena, which are sublated in the waking state. It has no reference to the world. The author of the Brahmasutras means, there, that the dream experiences being not full representations of those of the waking state, are not to be taken as real.

(8) The Gita mentions Maya in the sense of God's power. In Ch. VII-14-15, it is characterised as divine. If it were 'illusion', the adjective (*Daivi*) divine would not be a proper one. In XVIII-68, Maya is used in an instrumental case, suggesting that, God who resides in the hearts of men, makes them engaged in various activities through the instrumentality of his power, which is Maya. God moves men to action by means of his power according to His Will. In IV-6, Maya is used in a compound

word with Atman. Here also it means 'the power' that belongs to God. Elsewhere it is characterised as Yogamaya—the divine potency.

(9) There is one solitary instance occuring in the Madhu Vidya of Bridhadarayanka[1] in the sentence 'Indra is apprehended having many forms by his Mayas.[2] This has been interpreted by the Mayavadin as lending support to his Maya theory. But the interpretation is wrong. In this sentence, the word Maya is used in plural number and not in a singular number. If it meant illusion, then plural number is not required. Again the verb is '*Iyate*' which means 'is apprehended' and not 'seems'. Maya means 'predilections of intellect.' So the sentence means that Indra in multi-forms is apprehended so by the predictions of intellect. It does not mean that Brahman appears as having many forms on acccount of illusion. Shamkara has misunderstood this sentence.

(10) In Nighantu, Maya is understood as knowledge—.[3]

(11) On the strength of Chh. Up.[4] Shamkara asserts that in this, he finds support to his Mayavada. It says all things having names are *Vikaras*—modifications and therefore unreal. But this is Shamkara's misinterpretation of the Shriti. He has not kept in mind, the context in which it occurs. The real purport of this Shriti is not to teach unreality of the world; but non-difference between it Brahman. Badarayana has made it clear in his B. S.[5] Vallabhacharya remarks in his A.B. on the above sutra, that the word *Arambhana* in the above Shriti is suggestive of non-difference between the effect and its cause. This point can be elucidated, by bearing in mind its context. In the Chhandogya Upanishada, where the teacher wants to teach such knowledge, by knowing which, all knowledge is known, he says if it is known that Brahman is the cause of all the objects that full have names, and froms 'then' it is sufficient for the disciple for the knowledge of God. To explain this, three illustrations are given (1) that of earth and a jar, (2) of Iron and sword (3) of gold and an earring. By these illustrations, he points out that earth, iron and gold are causes out of which a jar, a sword and an ear-ornament are produced. Although earth etc. are causes and a jar etc. are effects, they should not be

---

[1] 4-5-18 [2] *Indro Mayabhihipururupahivate* [3] *Maya Vayana Gnanam.*
[4] C. U. 6-1. [5] B. S. 2-1-14

understood as different from their causes. The effects, no doubt, appear to be different; but that is only nominal. Essentially they are not different from earth etc. The differences are due to the names by which they are known in the world. No doubt, the jar is different from the earth, but this difference is cognised only by names. Really speaking there is no difference between the jar and the earth. In the same way, all objects in the world having names, seem to be different, but they are one, being manifestations of Brahman as a cause. The Shriti emphasises the non-difference between Brahman and the world —the cause and its effect. If it intended to convey the sense of unreality, then two words '*Vacharambhanam*' and '*Namdheyam*' should not have been used, as both mean the same thing. But it means to say, that the differences created by speech are simply by names (*namadheyam*). The words "*Mrittiketyeva Satyam*"–also support the above meaning. These words are to be spilt up as '*mritika -iti eva Satyam*". The jar is real as earth only. That is because the jar contains earth and it is non-different from it; and the oneness of both is the truth that one has to learn .If the point were to lay emphasis on earth as real: then '*Satya*' is not a correct word. It should be '*Satyaa*' a feminine form, for Mritika is a feminine word. Again this word is followed by '*iti*', in the sense of 'as'. Taking the context and the structure of the last part of the sentence, we conclude that its purport is to emphasise the sense of non-difference between Brahman and the world. The Mayavadin has totally misunderstood this.

The following points included in the criticism by Ramanuja are given additional to the above.

(12) If Maya is beginningless like Brahman, whom it conceals, then Maya should be accepted as the ultimate principle and Brahman as a subordinate one. If both are accepted, then it, will go against Shamakara's non-dualism.

(13) If Brahman is said to be a locus of Maya or illusion. it is against common sense, because the nature of Brahamn is knowledge and that of Maya is ignorance. It is like admitting that darkness has locus in the sun.

(14) It is not true that Brahman who is knowledge is concealed or conditioned by Maya which is ignornce. The two are opposed to each other in their nature.

(15) The word '*Asat*' in the *Purusha Sukta* in the beginning of the universe, does not mean illusion. It simply means 'unmanifest'. Before creation, the word was in unmanifested condition.

(16) If Shamkara says that this world is unreal, he must accept another world which is real, because his Maya is relative. If one mistakes silver in a shell, it is because he has previously seen silver which had existence; but now he mitsakes it for silver. In the same way, before Shamkara lays down his hypothesis about unreality of the world, he must show that he has seen the real world. Otherwise his knowledge of the unreality of the world will not have any value.

(17) The worldly objects are not unreal, like the dream phenomena; because the latter have no existence in the waking state, whereas the former have existence and they can be cognised by our senses.

The question then arises, 'How is it that the jar appears as different from earth? Why do we not apprehend it as earth, which essentially it is? To know it as earth, is the right knowledge, but in our common parlance and in the worldly dealings we think never of it as earth, instead of as a jar. Vallabhacharya offers the following explanation in his Subodhini commentary on the Bhagavata, where he says that our non-apprehension of earth in a jar, or of Brahman in the world, is due to a defet in our intellect. The faultiness of knowledge is not in the object but in our intellect. Our wrong knowledge about the world, viz. being not-apprehended as Brahman, is due to our defective intellect, and not because of the non-existence of Brahman in the object, the world. Brahman has existence even when we apprehend the world, but instead of apprehending the world as Brahman, we apprehend it as a separate entity, and not as Brahman. Vallabhacharya, says that Maya, which is the power of God, obeying the will of God, works in two ways. In one way, it conceals the real nature of Brahman who is a '*Vishaya*', and in the other way, it makes the world (*Vishayata*) appear as a separate entity which in fact is not so. Its power concals its real nature and makes it appear in various forms as if they are different from God. So for God's Lila *Maya* (God's power), performs double functions (1) the function of concealing the real nature of Brahman which pervadaes everywhere, at all the times, and (2) the other function at the same time, of producing that which has no existence as a separate object. The work of Maya is to create things for the "*lila*" of God only. It is our intellect which is responsible for wrong knowledge. The intellect as an instrument of knowledge is constituted of three qualities—*Sattva*, *Rajas* and *Tamas*. If *Sattva* (enlightenment) predominates, our knowledge will be correct and free from any doubt. But if *Tamas* (confusion or bewilderment) predominates, we do not know the thing correctly. When we mistake silver for a shell or a snake for a rope, it is because of the predominance of the *Tamas*, which so bewilders the intellect that it cannot have the correct view of the object perceived. So the incorrect view of the world, which is '*Sat*' aspect of Brahman, as '*Asat*' or unreal, is not due to Maya, but due to our defective intellect. If *Sattva* increases in the intellect, the *Tamas* will disappear as the darkness disappears in the presence of light, and with the disappearance of the *Tamas*, the intellect will shine in full lustre, revealing the right knowledge. In order to have the right knowledge about the world and its relation to Brahman, the darkness of intellect should be removed and the lustre of *Sattva* will shine. This is possible only by God's grace, company of the saintly persons, meditation, devotion and the study of the scriptures. It is on account of defective intellect that *Sat* which is 'Being' is apprehended as Becoming. Sattva, will give right interpretation of the world and will lead to God's awareness in the world. On the other hand, the Intellect with Tamas is the cause in the loss of God-consciousness, as a man travelling by a running train sees the trees on the road moving. Here the trees in fact are not moving; but they are stationary Only the train is moving. He transfers the motion of the train to the trees. This is incorrect knowledge on account of the fault of our intellect. If our intellect had been enlightened by the knowledge of motion, such an error would not occur. So to say that, this world, being the work of Maya is unreal, is absolutely wrong. The Maya, simply reveals out the world, which is real, as an instument because it is a form of *Akshara*, a form of God. Maya in bringing out the world, conceals the real nature of Brahman's censciousness and Bliss. This means that the world has existence, and is real as a form of God, though God as *Vishaya* is apprehended as the world (*Vishayata*). The incorrect view of not apprehending Brahman arises within the wrong intellect only. Such intellect does not apprehend the real world which is a form of Brahman, but another world, which interposes between the senses and the true object. The apprehension of the intellect is not of the real world, which is God's creation, but it is its own creation i.e. Intellect's creation The world is 'Being' aspect of God. It does not suffer any modification, either of change in the form of growth or decay; because in all these conditions, God's Being (Sat) remains unaffected.

The Theory of unmodifed change

It is a theory accepted by Vallabhacharya for explaining the change of the world-form from Brahman without any modification in Brahman. Vallabhacharya accepts the theory of change but the change is not understood in the sense of modification. The modification is unreal, but the change is real. Brahman according to him is not static, but is a dynamic principle. Although the Buddhists did not accept Brahman as the ultimate Reality, the cause of the world, they introduced for the first time, a theory of change in Indian Philosophy, to account for the momentariness of the things in the world. It is their belief that everything is momentary. A ceaseless change is going on continuously in which things are produced in the first moment and destroyed in the next. This is illustrated by the similies of the stream of a river and that of a lamp. The river in which one takes a bath is not the same at the next time when one takes a bath in it; because the waters are not the same. A river is only a continuous flow of water, which is different at different moments. It undergoes a change every moment. Similarly the flame in a burning candle is not the same. It is a series of different flames though we see it as one. In fact, every moment, there is a different flame, the succeeding one replacing the preceding one. Heraditus says the same thing, "you cannot bathe twice into the same river." William James puts it in a different form. Even Burgson who believes in Elan Vatal as the origin of things has supported the theory of change. All the Indian Philosophical systems accept the theory of change as regards the world; but they differ in their explanations. Samkhya accepts change as a necessary phenomenon in the evolutionary process of the world from Prakriti. (Matter). the world which existed in Prakriti is real like its cause. The Nyaya-Vaisheshikas think the world to be a change, produced from the combination of the atoms, by God, acting as an efficient cause, but the world did not originally exist in the atoms. It is altogether a new one. As it did not exist prior to its production, it is unreal. They mean that the change is unreal. To Samkhya, it was real. Shamkara accepts that the world is an effect, whose material cause is Maya-conditioned Brahman, so it is not real. It is only an appearance or *Vivarta*. He accepts the *Sat-Karyavada* of the Samkhya but differs from it, in believing the Maya—conditioned Brahman, instead of Prakriti as a material cause and the change i.e. the world as unreal. He differs from the Nyaya-Vàisheshikas who do not accept existence of the world in the cause, but agree with their belief of the unreality of the world, which he explains as appearance or *Vivarta*, having only phenomenal existence.

Ramanuja and Vallabhacharya accept the change as real, because it is caused by Brahman. Vallabhacharya propounds a special theory which is known as Avikrita Parinamavada for explaining the relation of the effect to the cause. According to him, emergence of the world from Brahman is no doubt a change; but this change is not modification. It is simply the manifestation of a cause in a different form. It is not a product. This shows his disagreement with the Samkhya, which, no ddoubt, believes that the change is real having its existence in the cause, but it is subject to modification such as production, increase, decay and destruction. Vallabha charya accepts production, increase, decay and destruction as changes, but not as modifications, because they do not affect the real nature of the thing, undergoing a change. The Samkhya illustrates its theory by an example of milk and butter. Butter is one form of change of milk, but once milk has become butter, the latter cannot be changed into milk. Butter cannot have again the property of milk. It means that this kind of change is called *Vikrita Parinama.* Vallabhacharya accepts every change as *Parinama*-trans-formation which does not differ from the original cause, because it is not conditioned by illusion. It is unaffected by any change. So he calls it as *Avikrita Parinama.* The ornaments of Gold are transformations of Gold, but they are not different from gold essentially. Before their transformations, they were gold, and after destructions they remain as gold.

In the same way, the world is a change from Brahman, and yet, it does not lose its nature of God-form. Even as the world, it is God and it will remain the same after its destruction. Shamkara's *Vivarta* theory cannot be accepted as it distinguishes two kinds of Brahman-The Determinate and The Indeterminate —and makes the former only the cause of the world which is also unreal, like its cause. This is opposed to the teaching of the Upanishadas. According to Vallabhacharya, God is one whether impersonal or personal. Impersonal God represents the negative aspect and personal God the positive one. He sees no conflict among the Shritis.

The Theory of Error (The Khyati Vada)

When we on seeing a rope say that it is a snake, it is mistaking a rope for a snake, this is known as an error.

The question is, to what is this error due? The problem of error is treated as an important subject in Indian epistemology. Each system of Indian philosophy tackles this problem in its own way. There are 9 theories attempting to explain the existence of error, namely (1) The '*Atmakhyativada*' of the Yogacharaya school of Buddhism (2) The *Asatkhyativada* of Madhyamika school of Buddhism (3) The *Akhyativada* of the Prabhakara school of Mimansakas (4) The *Viparitakhyativada* of the Bhatta school of Mimansakas (5) The *Anyathakhyativada* of the Nyaya school (6) The *Sadasatkhyativada* of the Samkhya school (7) The *Anirvachaniyakhyativada* of the Shamkara school (8) The *Akhyativada* or *Satkhyativada* of the Ramanuja school and (9) The *Anyathakhyativada* of the Madhava school.

Our main object here is to understand Vallabhacharya's view of the error. We shall, however, first know the views of other schools mentioned above. The Buddhistsic school is non-vedic. The First and second theories represent two different theories of the Buddhistic school. Taken both together, the Buddhistic school believes that knowledge by itself is not self-luminous. Its validity is to be established by extraneous circumstances. According to this school, consciousness or an idea is the only reality. but it appears as an external object. The object is unreal. The cognition of a jar is an error. It has no reality, but it is consciousness or ideas which is real. This view is opposed to the Upanishadic teaching which asserts that Brahman is knowledge and All is Brahman. If All is Brahman and Brahman is real, then all the objects like jars etc. are are real. There is no possibility of error at all, according to the Upanishadic view. The Bhatta school of Kumarila and the Prabhakara school are the two important schools of the Mimansa system. Kumarila and Prabhakara agree with each other in many points, but differ on the fundamental problem of Knowledge. Prabhakara believes that knowledge is self-luminous but not eternal He does not admit an error in the strict sense of the term. It is a partial-truth only. Kumarila, on the other hand, thinks knowledge as not self-luminous. According to Prabhakara it is an error of omission only, but according to Kumarila it is an error of omission and commission both. Error, for Prabhakara, is non-apprehension and for Kumarila, misrepresentation of one thing which exists elsewhere, in another thing. The rope and snake, both have their existence, each existing in a different place from the other and in a different manner. Only there is some likeness between the two and because of that apparent likeness, the error of mistaking a rope for a snake is committed. In this cognition, the fact of perception of rope is omitted and that of a snake, which has existence only in the memory. is perceived. Hence misapprehension of the real rope has arisen. The rope and the snake are two separate unrelated objects, but are wrongly welded together in our cognition. In short, it is a wrong synthesis of the two objects, one perceived or presented, and another, remembered or represented. The rope and the snake, as objects themselves, are real. Only their unitary knowledge is wrong. The objects thus brought in relation to one another are real, but the relation between them is unreal. Misapprehension is due to some defect in the knowledge process. However what is understood as an error is valid, even during the time, only the object 'rope' is mistaken for a snake.

The *Anyatha Khyati* of the Nyaya school is almost the same as that of Kumarila's *Viparita Khyati.* To both, error is misapprehension. This school however does not regard knowledge as intrinsically valid. It becomes valid only by extraneous condition. It asserts only that the presented object 'snake' is not the rope, but it corresponds to it in reality.

The *Sat-Khyati* of the Samkhya school corresponds to Prabhakkara's *Akhyati* theory. The error is that school is non-apprehension. According to Shamkaracharya it is indescribable. It is of the nature of superimposition of one object on another. It is an appearance only.

Ramanuja accepts Prabhakara's theory in a modified form. He says that all apprehension is real. Even error is real, so long it serves the purpose. So his theory is a combination of the *Sat-khyati* of the Samkhya and the *Akhyati* of Prabhakara. Now we have to consider this problem from the standpoint of Vallabhacharya. He proceeds in this question after accepting the axiomatic truth, that everything in this world is the manifestation of God. To him, Knowledge is a power of God. It is identified with truth (existence the 'being' aspect of God). It is revealed in all the existent things. The Gita says, God is the originator and distroyer of all things. He is everywhere, in our thoughts Wills and feelings. Every form of cognition, according to his belief, is also the revelation of God in a limited way. So, considered from this point of view, there is no error in reality. Even the so-called error has existence. It is an error only in name. This may be so theoretically, but in the practical world, we have an experience of an error 'wrong knowledge' which cannot be gainsaid. What is, then, the explanation of it? Vallabhacharya answers this question, by attributing it to the intellect, which interprets the objects in a wrong way. If one thing is mistaken for another, we must admit that there is some common point between the two by which one object is mistaken for another. Actually there is a rope before us, but we fail to see it as a rope and apprehend a snake. The eyes apprehend what is common to a rope and a snake. They see the snake-like form only in the rope but whether it is a snake or a rope is determined by our intellect only. Our intellect comprises of three elements the *Sattva*, the *Rajas* and the *Tamas*. If the Sattva is predominant, the object in its true nature will be apprehended, but if it is overpowered by Tamas it will not give the right apprehension. The intellect will determine that the object perceived may be a rope in fact, but it is perceived as a snake. The confusion is, primarily, due to the predominance of Tamas and, secondarily, due to the existence of a memory-image of a snake in the mind. So the error is to be explained by the combination of the three factors in the perception of a snake in rope (1) The Effect of Tamas (2) The existence of memory-image of a snake in the mind and (3) The attributes common to a snake and a rope. Due to this reason, the intellect gives us a wrong knowledge. It is therefore the intellect which is responsible for the wrong construction of an object percevied.

The *Shuddha-advaita* school divides the cases of error into two classes (1) *Nirupadhika* and (2) *Sopadhika*. The former is illustrated by the example of nacre and silver and the second by that of a jar which is taken to be revolving. In both these cases of an error it is due to wrong construction of the intellect, overpowered by *Tamas*, the existence of a memory image and common attributes. It may be with reference to a *Dharmin* (the substance) or the *Dharmas* (attributes). Apprehending a snake in a rope is an error, of the first kind, because both the snake and the rope in this instance are subjects. But if a white counch is misapprehended as yellow, it is an error of attributes, because yellow and white are the attributes of the substance,, a conch. This misapprehension is due to jaundice in the eyes. Shamkaracharya says that cognition of the world is not real. It is an error only. But Vallabhacharya holds that apprehending the world as world is not an error. Not only the world but the objects like jars are also real. To apprehend them as jars etc. is not erroneous knowledge; because they are manifestation of God. They are revealed from God's Being aspect. The world—a *Vishaya*—a subject which is a form of God, is real but we ascribe to it wrongly the attributes like change, growth, deminution and dissolution. These wrong attributes constitute the *Vishayata* which has its origin in the intellect. It comes in our way of perceiving the world as God's true creation, between the world and our senses. It shows the world not as of God's form God's 'Being' aspect but as the world as isolated and unrelated to Him. Vallabhacharya further says that, ultimately it is not intellect which is responsible for this God Himself, who by His divine power (Maya) stirs up the *Tamas* in the intellect and creates confusion in the right apprehension. Even error has a due place in God's creation which is motivated for His play or *Lila*. It is by God's Will that the soul becomes attached to mundane existence and thus labours under wrong knowledge. It identifies 'mundnae existence' with the world but thes are different from each other. The world God's creation and the Samsara the Soul's creation. It is by God's will that the real truth is hiddenden. It is necessary that God should hide Himself behind the world and the souls. The soul, separated from God, must seek Him in the world and in his own soul. P. Jaohanns S.J. has rightly appreciated this point in his book on Vallabha as under:

> 'God must be possessed after having been sought and found. But if God did not hide Himself and in Himself, the true self and the true world; He would never be sought. It is therefore all a hide-and-seek play.[1] Sansara is the great disease but it is only through disease that we fully appreciate the value of health."

There can be no better appreciation of Vallabhacharya's explanation of the error than this. It is all the work of God's Divine power which creates the world and binds the soul to it Just as the world-error is ultimately due to God's will or power so also all wrong cognitions attributed to intellect are due to God's will or power. In short, in Vallabhacharya's system everything is real and nothing wrong. It is neither bad or ill placed. It has its value in God's creation, as it is presented to us, because the presentation is by God Himself, for a particular end, Wrong things and errors have no real existence. If we view them as such for want of correct knowledge, we must treat them sympathetically. We should love them and make them right, by their right use.

The world of God (Jagat) and the world of ego (Samsara)

The world (*Jagat*) and the world of ego (*Samsara*) have all been used synominously in almost all Indian philosophical systems, but the distinction between the two is explained by Vallabhacharya in his Tattva Dipa Nirbandha[2]. There he says that it is wrong to identify the world with mundane existence and say that the world is unreal. What is unreal is the *sansara* and not the world. The world is God's own creation by His own will, through the instrumentality of His power called *Maya*, but *Sansara* is the creation of the soul due to ignorance. The *Samsara* is destroyed when ignorance is removed by knowledge. The world is not destroyed but when God desires to withdraw it, He himself takes it back into Him. The world is the form of God, representing His 'Being' aspect. so it is one with God. By looking at the world one can apprehend "Reality" but the *Samsara* makes one blind to it. The *samsara* is the condition of worldly bondage, which is self-created by a man's egoism, under the impact of ignorance which is responsible for five kinds of superimpositions in the soul. (1) forgetfulness of the soul's real nature, that it is God's part of consciousness (2) Superimposition of the soul on internal organs. (3) the superimposition on vital breath (4) Superimposition on the senses and (5) superimposition ont he body. Influenced by this five-fold nature of ignorance, the embodied souls forget their relation to God, and mistake their body, senses, vital breath and mind for soul, and suffer worldly bondage. They mistake God's things as their own and create artificial differences among men as friends or enemies. or know them as 'mine or thine.'

---

[1] P. 14.

[2] T. D. N. Part I in 23-24.

They are so engrossed in worldly affairs that they think, that worldly life alone affords best opportunities for enjoyments, and they feel that these enjoyments are permanent. They fail to differentiate between right and wrong, justice and injustice, merit and demerit and their consequences. They hanker after, and hoard worldly things, and do not care to know or seek God. This effect of ignorance gives rise to *Samsara*, which has no solid foundation. This is unreal, because when true knowledge about the relation of the soul dawns, ignorance will be removed, as darkness is removed by light, and the *Samsara* will then no longer exist. But the world cannot be destroyed. It can be withdrawn only by God by His own Will, but even then, its reality will not suffer. The Jagat is the 'being' aspect of God both before its manifestation and in the state of non-manifestation. It is an effect having for its material as well as efficient cause, Brahman. But the *Samsara* has no efficient cause. It has its cause in Ignorance. P. Johanns explains differences between the world and *Samsara* in the following words in his book on Vallabha. 'In the world there is no non-being, no transition from non-being, no growth or origin, no decay and death but only self-manifestation and self-concealment. But the soul within *Avidya* reads its own non-being and hence its non-intelligibility into the world and thus shuts it off from itself. It lives therefore, in a world of its own construction. In short the world is

God's creation and *Samsara* is soul's creation, real and unreal. The world is not subject to changes; Samsara is, subject to changes. The world is real; Samsara is unreal like a dream. The world is due to the Maya power of God, manufesting God's 'being' and concealing God's consciousness and bliss, Samsara is due to ignorance of the soul. The world is God*t*s work where as *Samsara* is man's work. *Samsara* is ended by removal of ignorance. The world is not ended but withdrawn into Himself by God by his own Will".

This difference between *Jagat* and *Sansara* was not known by Shamkara. He has confoounded the world with *Sansara*. He, however admits the reality of *Jagat* in the empirical state. Shuddhadvaita believes that all things that have existence are manifestations of God's attributes. The world is the manifestations of the 'being' aspect of Brahman. But the manifestation implies concealment of God's consciousness and bliss in it. Similarly, the souls are manifestations of, being and consciousness, without bliss. which concealed in them. Thus, everywhere God reveals His form and attributes in all objects by His two powers of manifestation and concealment. They are not opposed to each other like light and darkness. They assist each othêr in order to fulfil the purpose of God. Although all the objects are manifestations of God's being, for a specific purpose to serve as a means to a specific end, God endows these objects with a particular attribute, concealing others. It is *Lila* (Hide and seek-play) of God. In different objects, God's attributes are differently manifested. Yet in all of them God's 'Being' is commonly revealed. A jar and a cloth are two different objects, with different attributes of God; a jar having jarness and a cloth, clothness yet ultimately they have a common attribute of 'being' in all of them. Essentially, a jar and a cloth are not different. One and the same reality has only assumed different visibilities in them. In a jar, jarness is explicit; and, in a cloth, clothness is explicit though jarness is implicit in a cloth and clothness in a jar. These 'jarness' and 'clothness' are God's attributes. They are made explicit by God's power of manifestation and implicit by God's power of concealment. In a jar, clothness is concealed for a particular purpose. This does not mean that it is not in a jar. As a jar is manifestation of God's 'being', so is a cloth manifestation of God's 'being'. As 'being' they are not different although they differ in their outward forms as a jar and a cloth. God as a material cause of the world, assumes any form by His will for His *Lila*. In this *Lila* every object, animate or inanimate, has a purpose to serve God's will. The world with its multiplicity of objects is a Divine Play. In this divine play even a jar with its specific jarness has a divine purpose to serve. So it is to be looked upon only as the form of God made visible to us in a jar-form. This jar becomes a means for fetching water from the tank or a well. God assumes the form of a jar as a means to get water in order to help men drink water. Thus considered, all things are God Himself, as means for an end. The difference in the objects like a jar, a cloth etc. are only apparent. In fact there is no difference. Each thing expresses a particular attribute of God by manifestation, and conceals others. Only that which is most needed as a means is revealed in those things, concealing others in them. Those who do not know this, think them as different from each other, but as expressive of God's essence of 'being', synthetically they are one. Only in the analytical process they seem to be different. According to Vallabhacharya *Avirbhava* and *Tirobhava* are two powers belonging to God. What is implicit in God is made explicit by the power of manifestation and power of concealment makes what is explicit implicit in God. *Avirbhava* is defined as being fit for experienc ng and its opposite *Tirobhava.* as being not fit for experrenceing. Shamkara explains creation and differences of things as due to *Maya* (illusion). According to him all things are unreal. Samkhaya accepts these two powers, but it does not accept Brahman. It attributes causality to *Prakriti.*

The Naiyayika School would oppose this theory giving the following reasons:

(1) The manifestation is nothing but production. It is a misnomer of the term.

(2) The effect or a product called a jar did not pre-exist in its cause i.e. in clay. It is distinct from the cause and can never be identical with it. It is neither an appearance nor a transformation of the cause, but is a new thing altogether, produced by the operation of the cause.

(3) If the theory of existence is accepted, how shall we say, that in the negative state viz. absence of a thing, prior to its existence,

the thing is no more, on account of its distinction in a state of its complete absence in the world, and in the state of its being absent in another object as in the example of a jar of being not in the cloth? In this case, we must accept that the thing has no existence.

These objections are replied by the *Shuddhaa-dvaita* school as under:

(1) There is no production of a thing, but its manifestation, by the will of God. Hence all things as effects are real. They are not subject to production and destruction. In effect forms, they apear to be different from their cause, but really speaking they are not different. They represent 'being' aspect of God. God brings them out by His Will, and takes them back into Himself by His Will. So, they are manifested and withdrawn only.

(2) If a thing in the form of a product, is non-existent in the cause, how can it be produced, because, it has no existence? Only that thing, which has prior existence in a cause can be produced. If the theory of non-existence of a thing in a cause is accepted, anything can be produced from anything e.g. oil from sand particles. It will be unreal like the sky-flower.

(3) The cases of absence of existence pointed out by the Naiyaikas are misunderstood by that school. If understood in the light of the theory of manifestation and non-manifestation, they will not b examples of absence of existence. What is termed as existence is never absent in any form, whether as an effect or as a cause. It is 'being,' and not 'becoming,' essentially. A jar, even in a state prior to existence as such, exists in its cause viz. earth, which is God's 'being' (*Sat*). Only it is implicit before its manifestating and explicit as a jar. To say that there was no jar means the jar form, which is explicit now, was only implicit then, the word "*was*" in the sentence, 'There was a jar' which conveys the sense of the past tense, has reference to the jar once in existence. The use of '*was*' does not deny existence, but affirms it, in an implicit condition. Similarly in all other states of the so-called absence of existence, really speaking there is no denial of existence, but an affirmation of the implicit existence of the thing. Further, if the effect is to be understood as production, it must be supposed a *Dharma* (attribute) which must have its locus in some *Dharmin* (a substance), without which, there can be no production and this

must have another *Dharmin* (substance) as its locus and then another and so on. This will involve a fallacy of Infinite regress. If it is said that, that locus is Time, then, it must have another one, and that another. This way it will also involve the above fallacy. By admitting Brahman as a material cause, which manifests its 'being' (*sat*) aspect in the world, and the worldly things by His powers of manifestation and non-manifestation, there will arise no difficulty in explaining the so called differences in the world; and the relation of cause and effect is properly maintained without supposing wrong theories such as the non-existence or the *Maya* theory.

From the above discussion, we arrive at the following points regarding the nature of Brahman and its relation to the world:

(1) The cause of the world is Brahman.

(2) He, as Reality, is expressed in all the forms of worldly objects.

(3) The reality of Brahman is not affected in its world form.

(4) There is no otherness in Reality except Brahman. All objects are expressions of Brahman.

(5) The things as effects are expressive of some characteristic attributes of Brahman.

Souls

According to Shuddha-dvaita, souls are many and they are God's parts representing consciousness (*Chit*) together with 'being'. God's bliss is concealed in them. They differ from the world in having 'Being' with Consciousness of God.

The Samkhaya School believes in the plurality of Souls, and they are called as *Purushas*. These souls are independent. They are not related to God. They are in worldy bondage due to their contact with *Prakriti*.

The Naiyayikas believe in many souls. They are spiritual substances of two kinds—Human souls and God. Human Souls have limited knowledge. The superior soul, called God is omniscient. Although they accept God as an efficient cause of the world, they put God in the category of the souls, with the distinction that consciousness is an inseparable quality of God and it is an adventitious quality in ordinary souls.

The Mimansa School admits the plurality of the souls and regards them as eternal, omnipresent, ubiqutous (*Vibhu*) and as knowers, enjoyers and agents. As they do not believe in God, the souls have no relation with God.

Shamkara indentifies 'Soul' with Brahman and says that it is one but due to ignorance, it is misapprehended as many. This appearance of manyness in one soul (Brahman) is phenomenal and not real. Brahman, reflected into ignorance, appears as many souls in different bodies. By removing ignorance, by right knowledge the so called human soul will be cognised as identical with Brahman. To Ramanuja, souls are many and real. They constitute consciousness attribute of God. God unfolds Himself as many by His Will. The souls as God's attributes are inseparable from Him, in His causal state as well as in the effect state. They are knowers and enjoyers and also agents. Ramanuja regards them as attributes of God, but Vallabhacharya takes them as parts or constituents of God representing His consciousness. According to Vallabhacharya the relation between the souls and God is not that of the attributes or adjectives to the substantive, but that of the parts to the whole. Ramanuja explains this relation, by the relation of the body to the soul. The world and souls constitute God's body, and God is their soul.[1] To Ramanuja and Vallabhacharya, souls are real as God and not phenomenal. Vallabhacharya has touched this subject in his '*Tattva Dipa Nibandha*' Part I, under a section entitled a '*Chit Prakaran*'[1] in 53 to 64 Karikas. We shall note below some of these characteristics.

1. Souls are small. The size of souls is given in *Svetasvatara Up.*[2] equal to the front part of rice grain. Badarayana supports this view, by the following reasons:—(a) The Shruti passages 3-3 and S.U.V 8 refer to upward (*Utkrants*) movement, departure (*gati*) and returning (*Agati*) of the souls. This is possible only if souls are small and not pervading[3] the (c) S.U. 5/8 definitely says that the size of the soul is equal to one hundredth part of the hundredth part of an end of hair.

If an opponent argues; how can a soul with such a small size spread its consciousness in the whole body? It is answered[4] by the illustration of Sandal paste, which though applied to a small part of the body, is felt in the whole of the body because of its pervasive quality, so although the atomic soul resides in the heart, it makes its consciousness felt throughout the whole body on account of its pervasive character. The point is illustrated by an example of a lustrous jewel. A jewel may be a very small one, but its lustre spreads over a greater area beyond the place where it is kept.[1] The same is true about the smell of a small flower. The soul itself is small, but its quality i.e. consciousness is of pervasive character and extends over the whole body.

---

[1] B.S. II-3-18 to 40

[2] Chap-8

[3] B.S. 2-3-19 (b)

[4] B.S. 2-1-23-24.

2. Shamkara says that the soul is knowledge and not a knower In his view there are no differences of a knower, a knowable (object) and knowledge. These differences are due to nescience. They are phenominal appearances of Brahman which is knowledge. This is refuted by Badarayana.[2] and Vallabhacharya in his Anu Bhashya commentary. Brahman assumes the forms of knoweldge, a knower and knowable objects. Souls are no doubt as parts of God's consciousness, knowledge, but are knowers also.[3]

3. 'Just as souls are knowers, they are doers also. To Samkhya, doership belongs to Prakriti and not to the souls. But this is wrong. If this is not admitted, the scriptures which teach performance of sacrifices must be false and useless, and the Law of action will not operate. There will be chaos in the society, because no body will be prepared to undertake schemes of work for the welfare of the No one will have inclination towards what is morally good of the Society, if doers themseloes are not responsible for their acttons No body will be held responsible, for his work. The sinners will escape punishment, and the good shall have to suffer for the offences committed by wrong-doers. The whole social order will be disrupted. Truth, justice, and goodness will not prevail.[4] So souls must be supposed as agents. Each soul has to do a particular duty by which it rises or falls. For the progress of the society the dynamic principle of action must be accepted. God has evolved out of Him, action along with time and nature; because God needed it for His play.

---

[1] B.S. 2.-3-4. [2] B. S. 2-3-18 [3] B. 2-3-33 [4] B. S. 22-3-33 to 35

4. The souls are also enjoyers of fruits like a carpenter making a chariot, and enjoying a ride himself. Souls perform work and have to enjoy their fruits.[1]

5. The doership of the souls referred to above, in fact, is derived from God, who makes each soul do a particular deed and enjoy its fruit.[2] Each soul has to do a particular duty by which it rises or falls. For the progress of society, the dynamic principle of action must be accepted. It is the nature of an embodied soul to do action allotted to it by birth.

Of course, the reward of the deed is within the power of God. The work by itself cannot produce its fruit, as supposed by the Mimansakas. It is powerless in that respect.[3]

6. Souls are parts of God: because they have emanated from God, like sparks from fire. These sparks are parts of fire; because they contain the quality of fire. Souls also possess God's quality of consciousness with 'Being'. Badarayana endorses this view.[4] of the soulls being a portion of God. and even the Gita supports it in XV-7, where Krishna (God) says to Arjuna 'The soul in the body is an eternal portion of Myself" The objector may raise a doubt that, if souls are portions of God, then for the wrongs of souls, God shall have to suffer misery; because we see, if a foot, as a part of the body suffers, the whole body will experience pain. Badarayana replies that, although. fire or heat burns others, it is not affected by it. In the same way, souls suffer but God does not. Souls are parts of God; they are not God. God 'has being, consciousness and bliss' but souls have being, and consciousness but no bliss; at the most we may call them aa God's parts, having appearance or resemblance with God. Souls have being and consciousness only, which are of God. They are real, representing God's qualities though partially. By true knowledge and devotion, they will rise to the status of being like Brahman, but they will not be one or identiacal with Brahman.

Explanation of soul's fall from the divine state into the worldly state, as enbodied souls.

It[5] is stated that the fall of souls from their divinity is due to

---

[1] B.S.2-3-40 [2] K.U. 3/9. [3] B.S. 2-3-43. [4] B.S. 2-3-43.
[5] B.S. 3-2-5.

God's will for His own Lila, and for fulfilling souls' desires for worldly enjoyment. God Himself conceals His own divine attributes from souls. These attributes are six—greatness, potency, glory, beauty, knowledge and detachment from the world. Disappearance of greatness makes the soul-miserable and dependent, that of potency, a slave of his passions and desires. Loss of glory and beauty makes him humble and lonely. He finds no recognition from any one and feels himself unhappy. Loss of knowledge makes him forget his relation to God and loss of detachment makes the soul attached to worldly pleasures. These two are responsible ultimately for the soul's ruin.

Further, after separation, the soul is subjected to the influence of nescience which becomes the cause of its worldly bondage and sufferings.

Like knowledge, Nescience is also the power of God. Knowledge liberates the soul from worldly bondage, and Nescience brings the soul in the worldly state. Nescience operates on the soul in five ways.

Five ways of the operation of Nescience or Avidya

These five ways mentioned by Vallabhacharya in 'Tattva Dipa Nibandha are'[1] (1) forgetfulness of soul's real nature as a part of God's consciousness (2) Superimposition of the soul on the body (3) Superimposition on senses (4) Superimposition on Vital breath (5) Its Superimposition on mind or internal organs. Ignorance first makes the soul forget its real nature, that it is divine and belongs to God. It makes it mistake his body for the soul. The man loves his body so much that he identifies his soul with the body and thinks of the body alone, as given to him for the enjoyment of pleasure. He enjoys best the of food and drinks, decorates the body with fine apparel and ornaments, under the impact of the superimposition of the soul on the senses, and the functions of the senses are mistaken for those of the soul. The attributes and qualities of the senses are believed as belonging to the soul viz. blindness of eyes, muteness of tongues, deafness of ears, lameness of feet, etc. These operations of defective senses are wrongly supposed as those of his soul, when a man says, 'I am blind or mute etc.' Even his mental functtions, due to impact of ignorance are falsely taken for those of the soul. In short, one becomes conscious of body, senses, mind etc. but not of his soul. Forgetfulness of its real nature and superimpositions become the cause of his worldly bondage. By attachment to worldliness, a man turns away from God, completely forgets that he belongs to God and so believes that he is completely transferred into a worldly state from the divine. The soul passes through two processes in its state of transformation from divine to worldly state. The first process is the work of God. It is due to God who willed to be 'many' for His divine sport for which God's attributes are concealed from the soul. The second process is the work of Avidya. It is started by God's will for His Lila, and is finished by Avidya. This *Avidya* is also God's power, subject to God's will. Ignorance also is the cause of worldly bondage. If it is so, a question may arise" Should we believe that the soul should remain in this state permanently? Is there no freedom from this bondage? Is there no regaining of its divinity or restoration to God?" Vallabhacharya says that this state is not permanent. It is temporary, depending upon God's will, to free the soul from worldly bondage and to take it back as His own. God's power (*Vidya*) has to function as a means of freeing the soul from its embodied state and restoring it to its divinity. This *Vidya* counteracts and checks the operation of *Avidya*. Just as in the presence of light, darkness vanishes; so in the presence of *Vidya*, *Avidya* will disappear and the soul will feel its divine status.

---

[1] Part-I-32.

Vidya also works in five ways: (1) by detachment from the world (2) by desirelessness (3) by mind–control (4) by austerity (5) and by devotion to God.[1] Nescience is to be removed by knowledge for the soul's restoration to its divinity. It is not verbal or scriptural knowedge merely but it is the knowledge which should change the tendency of the mind by which it might get turned from worldly objects and be directed to God, for, unless the mind-tendency is not changed, the soul cannot get freedom from worldly bondage. The soul's chief instrument for getting knowledge is the mind. It should be so trained that it can give a right kind of guidance to the soul in seeking God and regaining its divinity. *Avidya* by its opposite force is the cause of the soul's degradation, but Vidya is the cause of its rise. Both are the powers of God. When God desires to make soul free from bondage, by means of His knowledge-power, first of all, He creates in the mind disgust for the world, then, frees it from desires for any worldly achievements, which enable him to exercise control upon mind, and make the soul undergo pangs of separation from God. Attainment of Love for God is the climax of knowledge. When knowledge reaches this climax, God Himself enters the soul and makes it perfectly divine, like fire entering a ball of iron and making it hot. God's divinity is then realised and the soul becomes conscious of its true relation to God and its bliss. Not only that, but also God recognises the soul once more as His own, and makes it participate in His divine bliss.

---

[1] T.D.N. I-43.

Refutation of the Shamkarites, re: the origin of souls.

To Shamkara, human souls are phenomenal. They are due to illusion. On account of *Maya*, Brahman, who is one, appears to be many as individual souls, but really speaking souls are not many. Among his followers, there were six sub schools of thought, which explain the origin of individual souls by the Reflection Theory. These six schools offer six different explanations, although they agree among them in holding the Reflection theory. Their differences are indicated as under:—

(1) Reflection of consciousness in *Maya* is personal God and of the same in *Avidya,* is a human soul.

(2) Reflection of consciousness in *Maya* constituted of *Sattva,* is *Isvara* and that in *Avidya* constituted of *Tamas* and *Rajas* is a human soul.

(3) Reflection in projecting *Maya* is Isvara and in enveloping *Avidya* is human soul.

(4) Reflection of consciousness in *Avidya* is *Isvara* and that in the internal organ is a human soul.

(5) Reflection of consciousness in the intellect of man influenced by *Tamas* of *Maya* whose locus in *Brahman* is *Isvara,* and the reflection of the same in the internal organ is a human soul.

(6) Reflection of *Isvara* in *Avidya* is a human soul.

Inspite of these differences, all these Shamkarite schools agree in one respect that the soul is a reflection of Brahman (consciousness) either in *Maya* (Illusion) or (*Avidya*) nescience. To Shamkara, *Maya* and *Avidya* are one and the same and not different.

This reflection theory has been severely criticised by Vallabhacharya in his 'Tattva Dipa Nibandha'[1]. He offers the following reasons for its rejection.

(1) The law of reflection requires that there should be no screen between an object and a mirror; otherwise the object will not be reflected in the mirror. But as *Brahman* is enveloped by *Maya* and it being a screen, it cannot produce Brahman's reflection.

(2) A thing to be reflected must have some form; otherwise, there cannot be a reflection. According to Shamkara, Brahman is formless and so It cannot be reflected in *Maya*.

(3) Again, unless the mirror is clear, it cannot reflect an object, into it. *Maya*, by nature being impure, cannot reflect Brahman.

(4) *Maya* enveloping Brahman is very proximate to Brahman. Now, it is well known that even a small line, scratched in a mirror being very closely proximate to it, does not cast its reflection in the mirror. *Maya* also being very proximate to Brahman cannot have reflection.

(5) The object to be reflected, and a reflected object, must not be in the same place, but must be located, apart from each other with at least some distance; but according to the Shriti, Brahman and soul are described as birds perching on the same bough of the tree of the world-one enjoying the fruits of action, and the other watching it as a witness. This means that both the soul and Brahman reside in the same place not in different places; hence there can be no reflection of *Maya* in *Brahman*.

(6) The soul and Brahman as *Antaryamin* are described by the Shritis to have entered the innermost part of the heart. It is entry and not reflection.

(7) The Gita[2] says that the soul is an *Amsa* of Brahman. It, no where, describes it as Brahman's reflection.

---

[1] part I-58-59. [2] XV:7

(8) If the soul is a reflection, its upward movement, departure from this life and returning to the world, which have been described in the Gita[1] would not be possible.

(9) If the soul is believed to be a reflection, then the mirror being destroyed, the reflection also will be destroyed. If by knowledge, ignorance (mirror) is destroyed, then, according to this supposition, the soul (reflection) will also be destroyed.

The sponsors of the Reflection theory have no solid basis. It is only a fancy unsupported by reason or the scriptures.

Criticism of Shamkara's interpretation of 'Thou art That'

The sentence '*Tattvamasi*' which occurs in the Chhandogya Upanishad in the Shvetaketu episode, is considered as a great sentence, pregnant with supreme truth, teaching identity between the soul and Brahman, according to Shmkara. The sentence is split up into three words '*Tat, tvam, asi*' and is translated as 'Thou' (The human soul) art 'That' (Brahman, Supreme soul), This meaning, is derived by the power of the word called "indication", particularly known as *Jahad-ajahad Lakshana* or *Bhaga Tyaga Lakshana*. The sentence literally means 'The embodied soul is really Supreme soul' This identification between human soul and Supreme soul is to be understood by the power of indication.

Vallabhacharya examines this interpretation in his[2] T.D. and finds it defective.

(1) The sentence selected by Shamkara is only a part of the sentence and it cannot be a *Mahavakya.* The whole discourse, preached nine times, should be taken as a *Mahavakya.*

(2) Shamkara has not taken the context into consideration. The Shriti of which it forms a part, begins with the statement about the knowledge, by knowing which, all knowledge heard or unheard is known. To emphasise this point, the same thing is preached nine times by different examples. But in all of them, the main point is to teach, that the world and the soul are not different from Brahman. It does not teach identity of the soul with Brahman. Oneness or non-difference is not identity, because it reveals Brahman's 'being.' Souls are also one with Brahman because they reveal its con-

---

[1] XV-10. [2] part I, 61-62,

sciousness. Souls are not identical with Brahman but acquire the status of likeness with Brahman. The Shriti in which this so-called *Mahavakya* occurs begins with the words, '*Aitadatimyamidam Sarvam*'. All 'this' (*idam*) is of the nature of 'that' (Brahman). *Idam* 'This' refers to the world. It means that this world has the essence of Brahman. These words are followed by '*Tat Satyam.*' 'That is real.' The world having essence of Brahman is real. This is followed by a similar statement about the soul. That both the world and the souls, have the essence of Brahman is further made clear by the words '*Sa Atma*'. 'He is God'. These words are to be taken with the previous portion pertaining to the world and the latter portion pertaining to the soul, which is described by the words.—'*Tattvamasi*'. Vallabhacharya does not accept Shamkara's claim that the purport of that sentence is to teach identity between the soul and Brahman; but he says that the whole Shriti should be taken into consideration and not a portion, detached from the context. If the whole is understood in its proper context, it will be clear that its purpose is to teach that the world and the soul are not different from Brahman, being Brahman's parts.

He does not split up this sentence into three words (*Tat*, *Tvam*, *asi*) as Shamkara does, but in two words *Tattvam*, *Asi*. *Tattva* i.e. *state* of *Tat* (*Brahmanhood*). *Tvam* is not a second person singular form but a termination conveying the sense of a state, added to *Tat* (Brahman). The meaning therefore is that the soul is an essence of Brahman as Its "*amsha*" (a part).

Ramanuja explains *Tattva* as *Tasya Tvam*, taking '*Tat*' in a genitive case, implying the sense, 'Thou art His i.e. God's.' The purport of the sentence is to convey the sense that the soul belongs to Brahman. Thereby, he thinks that the relation of the soul to God, is that of a servant to a master.

Madhva reads it as '*Atattvamasi*' and explains it as 'Thou art not That (Brahman,) but only a soul.' He is a dualist, and believes that the souls are not one with Brahman.

Vallabhacharya, as shown above, understands this sentence conveying non-difference between the souls and Brahman, because they are Brahman's parts. The Shriti in which these words occur, contains this truth in two parts—first relating to the world and the second to the souls. Translated into english the

Shriti reads as 'Brahman who is subtle is in all.' This whole world is in essence Brahman and it is real. Like the world, the soul also is the essence of Brahman. Oh Shvetaketu, thou hast the essence of Brahman, Madhavacharya being dualist, does not accept the soul as an '*Amsha*' of God. His main contention against this theory is that, if on the analogy of the relation of the sparks and fire, the souls are considered as '*Amshas*' of Brahman, then, just as sparks have light in them; so the souls must have knowledge in them. They must be omniscient like God; but it is not so. They either have no knowledge or have limited knowledge. Again, if they are parts of God, then God must be held responsible for the deeds of the souls, who are His parts. Hands and feet being parts of the body, all deeds done by them separately are considered as the deeds of the body. As the fruit of the deeds, good or bad, must be enjoyed by the body; so the souls must not be responsible for their deeds, but it must be God's responsibility. Hence the '*Amsha*' theory is not sound. To this, the Shuddha-advaita school replies that Madhva has not properly grasped the significance of the analogy of the sparks and fire. Its purport is to point out non-difference between the souls and Brahman like that between sparks and fire. Although they are parts of Brahman, they lack knowledge.[1] This is attributed to God's will. God hides His dvine qualities of greatness, knowledge etc. in the souls for his Lila. It is God's own doing. If God does not hide knowledge in the souls, He would not enjoy His Lila. As it is God's Lila, the responsibility of the deeds of the souls is not that of God. God has brought the souls under the Law of action, by which the soul bears the fruit of its deeds. It is God's will.

Madhava's view conflicts with Badarayan's view[2], where the word '*amsha*' has been specifically used to convey the sense that the soul is an *amsha* of Brahman. The Gita also says the same thing.[3] In the face of this scriptural testimony, Madhava's objection cannot be accepted. Vallabhacharya's sole reliance in the matter of knowledge about God, the world and the souls, is on the scriptures only.

---

[1] B.S. 3-2-5-. [2] B.S. 2-3-43-, [3] XV-7

Relation of the souls to God

The illustration in the Shriti, of the fire and the sparks for explaining the relation of the souls to God brings out the following characteristics of the souls.

(1) Souls are many like the sparks issuing from fire.

(2) Just as the sparks resemble fire in brilliancy or lustre, so the souls resemble God in His consciousness.

(3) Like the sparks, the souls are manifested forms of God. They are not products.

(4) Just as the sparks are particles of fire, so also the souls are parts of God.

(5) As fire is greater than its spark, so God also is greater than the souls.

(6) As the sparks are smaller than fire, so the souls are also smaller than God. They are atomic in size.

(7) The sparks contain inherent potentiality of entering the fire; the souls also have the inherent potentiality of entering God.

(8) Just as the sparks, after entering fire, have no separate existence from fire; in the same way the souls, after entering God, have no separate existence. They are non-different from God.

(9) A spark even after entering the fire can reappear from it.

In the same way, the soul in liberation can reappear from *Brahman.*

The Kinds of Souls

As representing consciousness of God, all souls are alike; but in the worldly state, they differ from each other, by their tendencies of mind, pursuits, virtues etc. However, the Upanishads and the Gita, divide them in two kinds—the Divine and the Demonic, or Free souls and Bound souls. Ramanuja divides them in three kinds—Eternal souls, free or liberated souls and bound souls. The eternal souls are not subject to birth and death. They live in *Vaikuntha* (the region of God) for ever and render constant service to God. The released souls were once bound to the world but got liberation by their actions, knowledge and devotion. The bound souls are subject to the continuous process of births and deaths in the world, on account of their ignorance and bad works. Madhva also recognises these three divisions.

Vallabhacharya has three broad divisions but designates them using new words—Pushti, Maryada and Pravaha. The characteristics of these souls are enumerated by him, in his work—*Pushti-Pravaha-Maryada.*

Now let us try to understand what he means by these three new terms.

The divisions of the souls into above three broad categories refer to their states after their separation from God and immersion in the worldly state. During the worldly state, they forget their relation to God and get attached to worldly happiness. These souls lack spirituality in them. They have no higher goal than the happiness of this world. These souls are called '*The Pravahi*'.

Those who are conscious of their relation to God and endeavour by their knowledge or devotion, to transcend the worldly state are higher kinds of souls, known as "*The Maryada*" souls. The souls who shun worldly happiness and yearn only for love and grace of God and seek union with God are the highest, known as '*Pushti*' souls.

The Gita mentions only two types—(1) The *Daivy* souls and (2) The *Asuri* Souls in Chapter XVI. That scheme defferentiates divine virtues from demonical qualities. Vallabhacharya calls the Asuri or demonical souls as *Pravahi.* The Divine souls in the Gita, represent only one class including the Spiritual and the Divine Souls. But Vallabhacharya divides the Divine Souls into two divisions of the '*Pushti*' souls and the '*Maryada*' souls. As means for God's Union, the Gita mentions sacrifice, knowledge, mental discipline, austerity, devotion, faith, and absolute surrender to God. The Gita does not recognise the distinction of the '*Pushti*' souls and the' *Maryada*' souls. All who seek union with God either through means or without means are called '*Daivy*–Divine–Souls. Vallabhacharya, however, distinguishes, these two types of the *Daivi* souls, by naming them as the *Maryada* and the *Pushti* souls. He has made the Gita idea of souls, lucid and distinctly clear, by his three divisions.

The *Pravahi* souls are worldly souls. They are too much engrossed in worldly affairs. 'Pravaha' means a stream, here meaning the stream of worldliness. A thing fallen into a stream does not come out of it. It is tossed up and down and swept away, hither and thither, by the force of water. In the same way, these *Pravahi* souls never come out of the world. The world is too much with them. They waste their lives in idle pursuit of the worldly pleasures, which ultimately make them unhappy. They do not discriminate between *Pravriti* (work) and *Nivriti* (rest) described in the Gita (XVI–7). Their actions are impure, their minds unholy and their conduct objectionable. They love falsehood and hate truth. They do not believe in God, lack understanding, are ill-disposed, take delight in perpetrating cruel actions, and indulge themselves in destructive activities only. They are hypocrites, conceited and arrogant. They are slaves of insatiable passion. They are intoxicated with power and mad for money which they hunt by unlawful means. Their minds oscillate between hopes and despairs. They have no contentment. There is no end to their desires. They are full of egoism, violence, insolence, passion and anger. They hate God and all good men, and remain permanently in worldly bondage. '*Eat, drink and be merry*" is their only motto of life. They are self-centred and never come out from the stream of *Samsara*. After death they take birth again. They are never free from the process of birth and death. Because of their tendency to remain in the stream of worldly life, they are designated by Vallabhacharya as the *Pravahi* souls.

The *Maryada* souls are spiritual. They are no doubt in the world, but they make efforts to be released from the world, by their behaviour in accordance with the prescriptions and injunctions of the scriptures. They have faith in God and in the holy books. Their rules of conduct are derived from the scriptures and the conduct of saintly persons. They are not after worldly pleasures because they consider them as poison. They seek peace of mind, which alone is real happiness to them. They prefer rest to work. They know what kind of work is worth doing. They are fearless, lovers of truth, pure and kind-hearted, charitable, well disposed to all persons irrespective of caste, creed or colour, non-violent in thought, word and speech, free from pride, anger, greed and lust.

Sublimity, forgiveness, fortitude, absence of the feeling of self-importance are their chief marks. Their goal is liberation from the world through Vedic means, such as performance of sacrifices, knowledge, austerity, self control, worship and devotion. Spirituality as well as peace of mind is their motto. They believe in giving others what they possess and what is beneficial to others. They live their life according to the rules (*Maryada*) of the scriptures. Their aim is also union with God, through the means laid down in the scriptures.

The *Pushti* souls are of the highest type. They seek God's love and grace only and nothing else. Although they are in the world, they belong to God, bodily and mentally. They live in the world but are detached from the world and at the same time attached to God alone.

The difference of the natures of these souls and their origin with their marks have been explained by Vallabhacharya in his work P.P.M. The *Pushti* souls originate from God's body, the Bliss-form. The *Maryada* souls from God's speech (word or the Vedas) and the *Pravahi* souls, from God's Mind or Will. The goal of the *Pushti* souls is God's love and participation in His Bliss, that of the *Maryada* souls, liberation and of the *Pravahi* souls, the securing of the worldly happiness.

The *Pushti* souls are ever conscious of their relation to God. God is the centre of their love. They live for God alone. They yearn to behold Him, to be united with Him and to enjoy bliss of His embrace. The *Maryada* souls have faith in the Vedas or the scriptures and pursue such activities that will enable them to secure their release from worldly bondage and integrate them with *Akshara* form of *Brahman.* The *Pravahi* souls have nothing to do with God, or the scriptures. They do not have any rules, are self-willed and are unsteady in their aim, which varies from time to time, according to the caprices of their mind.

The *Pushti* souls are the best of all; because they have their origin from God's Bliss form. They resemble God in nature, descent, external signs and attributes. Like God, they possess bliss, which is manifested through supreme love for God. They are devoted to the service of God alone. They are completely divine in all respects. Their body, senses, mind and soul are saturated with the love of God. They do not care for liberation. Their only desire is to participate in God's bliss. Such *Pushti* souls are very rare. They deserve God's grace. The *Maryada* souls are, no doubt seekers of God and possess good virtues-faith in the scriptures, knowledge of God and even devotion; but they lack love for God. Knowledge and devotion are resorted to, by them as means only. The *Pushti* souls do not resort to any means. God's grace is the only means for them, attained by transcendental and divine love. In worldly life, we find mixed Pushti souls. *Pushti Pushti, Pushti Maryada* and *Pushti-Pravaha* souls. These mixed souls are *Pushti* by nature; they have love for God and seek God's grace but in the worldly state, their minds sometimes turn away from God's love and are attached to the worldly pleasures. The *Pushti Maryada* souls are mostly under the influence of the scriptures even though they love God. The *Pushti-Pushti* souls are perfect souls in their love for God. The *Shuddha Pushti* souls are extremely rare. They remain in close proximity of God as participators and witnesses of the bliss of God's Divine Play (*Rasa*).

The *Pravahi* souls, according to Vallabhacharya have two subdivisions (1) Ignorant-souls and (2) Possessors of ill knowledge. The former are not bad before their birth. They were good souls in their previous life, but due to some curse from a holy person for some fault, suffered a fall. There is hope of their redemption or regaining their former status. The second type of the *Pravahi* souls are forsaken souls, for ever thrown off from God's grace, by God's will for His *Lila*. If God wills to bring them back to His Path, He may do so; but, by themselves, they are reluctant to seek God's shelter, by way of improvement in their conduct.

Besides these divisions, Vallabhacharya notes one more type, known as *Charshani* souls. They are wanderers in the sense that they do not stick to one thing. They waver and have no definite purpose or goal. They do not know what they want to do or achieve. The *Pushti-Pravaha-Maryada* work, which is Vallabhacharya's attempt at the classification of the souls, is incomplete. It is believed that if it were complete, Vallabhacharya would have described three further sub-types of mixed Maryada souls as

Maryada-Pushti, *Maryada-Maryada* and *Maryada-Pravaha*, and also mixed *Pravaha* souls, as *Pravaha Pushti*, *Pravaha Maryada* and *Pravaha Pravaha* with their marks.

Shri Vallabhacharya's path of devotion is known as '*Pushti-Marga*' or 'Path of Grace of God'. This word is specially selected by him to differentiate it from the *Maryada-Marga*, which teaches God-realisation through scriptural means.

Badarayana says that the doctrine of *Pushtimarga* is very subtle, and beyond comprehension and reach of ordinary men; because it is not to be learnt from the scriptures, but it is to be experienced in one's own heart. In many places, Vitthaleshji has explained the differences of *Pushti marga* from the *Maryadamarga* in his commentary on the Brahmasutras. *Maryada marga* is a path of knowledge and devotion and *Pushti Marga* is the path of the love-type Devotion and grace of God.

The word '*Pushti*' has been very much misunderstood by ignorant persons. Some who are inimical to this Marga deliberately misinterpret it. The word is no doubt derived, etymologically, from the root '*push*' to feed, to nourish, to develop; it does not mean that, according to this path, the body is to be fattened by food. It is rather a path for the development of the soul which is weak and feeble and lustreless in the embodied state The soul has to be made strong and lustrous by the love of God. Love is the food by which the soul is nourished and developed, so that it can enjoy the bliss of God. Vallabhacharya's philosophy does not, any where, lay emphasis on the seeking of the material comforts. On the contrary, it teaches their avoidance and non-attachment to them. It is not the path of feeding or fattening the body, but of nourishing or developing the soul by the knowledge of God, service to Him and suffering pangs of separation from Him. The word *Pushti* also is indicative of grace of God. The 6th canto of the Bhagavata, describes its nature, characterising it as 'Poshana' lila in the same sense. Pushti souls are the recepients of God's grace. This idea of grace occurs in the Kathopanishada, where it is said 'God cannot be attained by sermons, superior intellect, prodigious learning, but by him whom God chooses or favours." Grace is God's '*Varana*'—choosing—of the soul. In the Shriti it is said to be God's *Prasada*. Vallabhacharya uses the word '*Pushti*' to connote the sense of choosing and grace of God as stated in the Upanishada. The words 'choosing' and 'grace' are synonymous of '*Pushti*'. This conception of '*Pushti*' is not unknown to the Upanishadas. It is, there, but was not noticed by other Acharyas before Vallabha. The credit of its discovery and naming a religious system as '*Pushti*' Marga goes to Vallabhacharya alone.

Pushti as stated by Vallabhacharya in his *Bhagavatartha Prakarana*[1], is a power of God in the form of His grace, granting protection to the devotee, by rendering ineffective the consequences of evil deeds, and by checking the power of Time and transforming his nature. It affords protection to the devotee both internnally and externally against all evils. The 'Pushti' soul has not to suffer the consequences of the violations of the scriptures, and transcendence of moral laws or social codes; because his affinity is only with God and not with the society, state, or the world: though as long as he is a worldly soul, he observes all social codes, ethical codes and the state laws.

God-Absolute or Personal:

Before we conclude this chapter, we shall clarify Vallabhacharya's concept of God. He accepts the Upanishadic concept of Brahman which is both Absolute-Infinite and Personal. He does not make any distinction between the two. It is one and the same Supreme Reality which is conceived as the Absolute or the Personal. As the absolute, it is unmanifest and as Personal it is manifest. Shamkaracharya discriminates between the two; the former is known as Brahman (the Absolute) and the latter as Ishvara (God). The Absolute is the Supreme Reality but God has no reality; God is the Sat-Chit-Ananda, the Existence -Consciousness-Bliss. He is the creator, sustainer and Destroyer of the Universe. The Western Philosophy discusses this subject of supreme Reality. Some identify the Absolute with God and some differentiate one from the other. Hegel holds that God is not only Absolute but also Personal. Schiller objects to the 'Absolute' on the following arguments:—

(1) God is not Absolute. We cannot account for the world without a finite or personal God.

---

[1] VI.-2.

(2) If God is Absolute or Infinite, then the problem of evil in the world would be insolvable, unless God is made irresponsible for every evil.

(3) By accepting God as Infinite, we have to deny God's attributes, such as conscience, goodness, intelligence etc. If we say that God is possessed of the attributes, we accept thereby God's personality. We cannot imagine God absolutely without any attributes. Even the words, like Infinite, Indescribable, unthinkable, etc. used to describe God prove that God is personal.

(4) Our world is finite. It has a form and is a concrete thing. It is an effect, evolved from God, its cause. If the effect is finite, then the cause must be finite. If the effect has a form its cause must have a form. So God as the creator of the world, must be Personal.

Schiller, however, adds that God's personality is different in nature from that of ·men and transcends it. Men's personality is human, but God's personality is divine or supernatural.

Dr. Rashdell, the author of Personal Idealism, observes that the Absolute cannot be identified with God. The Absolute must include God and all other consciousness not as isolated and unrelated beings; but as intimately related to Him and to one another and as forming with Him a system or unity. God and the spirits both are the Absolute, not God alone. According to him, God is a separate form of the Absolute. His limitation is self-imposed. He differs from Shamkara, who thinks that the personality of God is due to illusion or ignorance. Vallabhacharya holds that the personality of God is His inherent nature and is revealed in a variety of forms by His own Will. Dr. Rashdell, however, in an indirect way, accepts personal God. Balfour rejects the Absolute as useless. According to him, perssonal relations of love and worship can be maintained with God by men. In his book 'Philosophical Doubt' he says, that men can love and pray God and not the Absolute. God is the source of Truth, Goodness and Beauty. If there is truth in the world, it is because God is truth. If there are good things in the world, it is because God is the personification of Goodness. If there are beautiful objects, it is because God is the personification of Beauty. In this sense, God is personal and at the same time, super-personal or possessed of divine personality.

Here, we may make some reference to Aristotle's concept of God. According to him, there is God and He is related to the world, but only, as the loved object is related to the lover. God is unmoved although He is the Prime Mover of the world. He is non-creative, non-interested and aloof. He has no interest in the world. Prof. Joad criticises his concept of God in his book 'God and Evil'. To him Aristotle's concept of God is not acceptable. He makes God the mover of the world. The world yearns after Him and the yearning is the cause of movement and development in the world; but although as a mover, God arouses the world's desire and is the cause of its development. He is neither the creator of the world, nor aware of the process which He himself has set going on. To posit God as a Mover and to deny Him as a creator, is an apparent contradiction. If God moves, it means that the urge of movement and creation, set the ball rolling. By making God unmoved, Aristotle denies personality to God. Prof. Joad observes that Aristotle is illogical in making such an admission. He betrays his ignorance of the personality of God. God's personality is not like a man's personality. A man's personality, expresses itself in the life he leads, in the gait and gestures of his body, in the tones of his voice, in the look of eyes and the moods of his temperament. God's personality is expressed in the values. He created them, is immanent in them and also is transcendent of them. All manifested objects are expressive of God's personality. As God is immanent in the world, He must be interested in the world. Of course, it is an omnipotent personality interested in everything and it is not immobile, but continuously active. Prof. Joad repudiates Aristotle's concept of God and recommends the Personal God, to the spiritual aspirants for seeking God. To make his sense of personality of God explicit, he observes:—

"Now it may be true that God permits Himself to be conceived as a personality, but if so, His personality can be at most only one aspect of the whole that He is,"

"I have suggested that goodness, truth and beauty are aspects of God under which He reveals His nature to man, so that in pursuing truth, we draw nearer to God, in knowing beauty, we know something about God, in doing our duty, experience something akin to His experience. But nobody would, I imagine, wish to suggest that God is beauty or is goodness or is truth." In other words, he means to say that although God has expressed His personality through, beauty and goodness, He is above them all, as his personality is Divine. Vallabha's idea of personality is similar to this. It is expressed in one word 'Sat-Chit-Ananda'. The Taitiriya Upanishad says—Brahmam is Truth, Knowledge and Infinite love. This idea is more succinctly expressed in the word 'love (*Rasa*)' which is God's form.

Dr. Radhakrishnan explains in the following passage the necessity of believing in Personal God.

"This Supreme Reality is difficult to grasp and impossible to define. We can be sure of what God is not, but not of what God is * * * This personal representation of God is nothing but one way of expressing the Reality.[1]

To Arvinda, 'the Divine Being' *Sat-chit-ananda* is both impersonal and personal. It is an existence and the origin and foundation of all truths, powers, existences; but it is also the one transcendent Conscious, Being and the Person of whom all conscious beings are the selves and personalities; for He is their highest self and the universal in-dwelling Presence.[2] Again he says, 'Sat-chit-ananda is the one with triple aspects. In the Supreme there are not three, but one,—Existence is consciousness, Consciousness is bliss and they are thus inseparable; not only inseparable but so much each other, that they are not distinct at all.[3] The three aspects of the Divine are referred to in the following passage:

"All realities and all aspects and all semblances are Brahman. Brahman is the Absolute, the transcendental, and incommunicable, the supra-cosmic existence that sustains the cosmos, the cosmic self that upholds all beings, but it is, too, the self of each individual; the soul or psychic entity is an eternal portion of the Isvara; it is his supreme Nature or consciousness force that has become the living being in the world of living beings[4]."

---

[1] The Religion we need. [2] Life Divine Vol. !II, P. 458 II eidtion.

[3] Light on Yoga P. 35 [4] Life Divine, Vol. II, 2nd Edition, P. 36.

It seems, Arvinda in the above words, expresses the view of Vallabhacharya. According to Vallabhacharya God is both subject and object. He is Being and Becoming by His Will. There are no differences of the subject and object in God, because even objects do not exist outside God. It is doubtful whether Arvinda had an access to the writings of Vallabhacharya but it is true that his philosophy about God is very much the same in essence with that of Vallabhacharya. The following extract explains the point about the ultimate nature of God,[1] 'He is the Brahman, who consciously supports and originates all from his higher spiritual Nature. Concisously he becomes all things in the nature of Intelligence, Mind, Life and Sense and objective phenomena of material existence. The Jiva (human soul) is He, in that spiritual nature of the eternal. His eternal multiplicity, His self-vision from many centres of conscious self power. God ,Nature and Jiva are the three terms of existence and these three are one Being. The same view is expressed by Vallabhacharya[2] wherein he says: 'God alone is knowable. He is both non-qualified (Absolute) and qualified (Personal). All attributes and actions in the objective world are His. He has triple forms—the original (*Swarupa*), as the cause of the world, (*Karana*) and as an effect the world (*Karya*). These three forms are not separate but are the three aspects of one and the same God. All the various manifestations of God-animate or inanimate, reveal God's own nature. In the unmanifest state, God is Absolute (*Para Brahma*) and in the manifest state He is Personal God (*Isvara*). Recognition of God as Absolute and Personal is the special merit of Vallabhacharya's philosophy.

In the words of Dr. Radhakrishnan, there is no difference between the Absolute and God. They are one and the same, only the difference is in their aspects. The true, the Absolute does not create and God creates; but that does not mean that these two are different. He says: "God, who is the creator, sustainer and judge of this world, is not totally unrelated to the Absolute. God is the Absolute from the human end. When we limit down the Absolute to its relation with the actual possibility, the Absolute appears as Supreme wisdom, Love and Goodness. . . . He is the creative mind of the world, with a consciousness of the general plan and direction of the cosmic, even before it is actualised in space and time. He holds the successive details in proper perspective and draws all things together in bonds of love and harmony. . . ."

---

[1] Arvind's Essays on the Gita, 2nd Series, P. 47.

[2] T.D.N. Pt. II. K. 84.

We call the Supreme, the Absolute, when we view it apart from the cosmos, and call God in relation to the cosmos. The Absolute is the pre-cosmic nature of God and God is the Absolute, from the cosmic point of view.[1] This is also the view of Ramanuja and Vallabha. Vallabha's identification of Absolute with God, is of such a kind, that in the identification, the Absolute has no separate existence from God. So according to him, there is only God, who is the Supreme Reality.

The Absolute is not commendable on psychological, ethical and religious grounds. If God-realisation is the goal, how can the Absolute be realised by the mind, by any of its faculties—intellect, feeling and will? The difference of the realiser and the realised must be accepted, without which the realiser cannot realise God, by mind. The Absolute is beyond the reach of mind. It is unthinkable and inaccessible. It cannot be the object of realisation. Ethically, the concept of the Absolute fails to make men lead a moral life. Unless one knows that there is God, as a judge and rewarder of our actions, no body will refrain from indulging arbitrarily in immoral and unjust deeds. But when one knows this he will behave better in his relation with others. The Absolute cannot influence a man to behave in a better way. It being an abstract entity. Religiously the Absolute cannot satisfy our purpose. It cannot be loved nor worshipped nor prayed. People offer prayers to God; because they believe that God will respond to their prayers. God in His concrete form can be easily made an object of the God-seeker's thought, love and will. for devotional purpose. The Gita gives its verdict on this question by stating that God has dual aspects-abstract (unmanifest) and concrete (manifest). The unmanifest is unthinkable, all pervading, imperishable, ineffable, eternal, immobile and inmutable. It is called Akshara. The manifest is God Purshottama. Both are

---

[1] An Idealist View of Life' P. 345.

God's forms but the former is very difficult to atta in. It can be attained only by knowledge. This path of knowledge is not possible for all. Only few exceptional souls can reach Brahman by resorting to It. But God's gifted souls realise Him, through devotion by resorting to His personal form.

Shri Arvinda expresses similar idea about Highest God in his Essays on the Gita p. 246 as under—"But the Divine is neither wholly the Kshara, nor wholly the Akshara. He is greater than the immutable self and He is much greater than the soul of mutable things. If He is capable of being both at once, it is because He is other than they, the Purushottama above all cosmos and yet extended in the world and extended in the Vedas, in self-knowledge and in cosmic experience."

CHAPTER III

VALLABHACHARYA AS A RELIGIOUS TEACHER

The highest form of God is Rasa *(Love). He who attains Him becomes enjoyer of Bliss.*

Taittiriya Upanishad

'*Love is the supreme means for the attainment of the Divine Bliss.*[1]

Vallabhacharya was not only a philosopher, but also a great religious thinker. He had studied all the religious systems of his time, and formulated his own independent views on the true nature of religion, which may rise to the level of a universal religion-the religion of heart and not of intellect. He thought that the Hindu religion as it existed, needed re-orientation, if it were to survive and to be serviceable for spiritual and divine life.

It is the main characteristic of the Hindu philosophy that it is neither speculative, nor dry, but serving a practical need of God-realisation, and therefore, the general nature of all the philosophical systems of India is religious. The philosophical speculations of all the commentators of the *Brahmasutras* are directed to God-realisation. The goals of both philosophy and religion being the same there is no antagonism between them, although outwardly, their provinces seem to be divergent. Shamkara, Ramanuja, Bhaskara, Madhava, Vallabha and Nimbarka were philosophers-cum-religious thinkers. To them philosophy, unaided by Religion, is barren, and religion without philosophy is blind. Both should cooperate with each other for the realisation of God. The way of approach to God by Philosophy is by intellect, reason or intuition and that by Religion, by love or divine service. Philosophy is thinking about God and Religion is feeling or experiencing God. Mere thinking without feeling has no value in spiritual life.

The Hindu Philosophers do not merely give us knowledge about God and the souls' relation to Him, but indicate some mode of feeling or experiencing Him by different ways such as sacrifice, mental discipline, knowledge, worship, renunciation and devotion. Vallabhacharya teaches the way of devotion of the love-type and the divine service for experiencing God. It is the distinguished feature of Vallabhacharya's religion.

---

[1] **Vallabhacharya T.D.N. II. 326.**

Religious life according to him is the life of God-realisation or union with God, through the grace of God. To distinguish his religion from other Hindu religions he names it as *Pushti Marga*—the path of Grace. He has explained the features of this new religion in his small works commonly known as "Sixteen works".

From the Vedas and other scriptures, one can know that there are three principal means for God-realisation—Action, Knowledge and Devotion. What is known as *Karma* is identified with sacrifices or the rituals in the Vedas. The Gita, however, does not understand it in that sense only, but in a wider snese, so as to include all kinds of works—physical as well as psychical. Shamkara, Ramanuja and Vallabhacharya generally understand it in the sense of a sacrifice. The *Brahmanas* which constitute the early portion of the Vedas give prominence to the *Karma*, (sacrifice) and describe its various types, the time for its performance, the materials needed for sacrificial purpose and the number of the priests required in the performance. The followers of the *Mimansa* school are warm supporters of *Karma*, which alone they consider as a true means for the development of a religious life. They believe that Men will get happiness or misery according to their actions (*Karma*). Their ideal is the attainment of heaven and not God.

According to them, the Vedic sacrifices should be performed with a view to securuing heavenly happiness. Shamkara does not recognise the usefulness of sacrifices as a means for a spiritual life. He says that, they are useless like frail and unreliable boats in crossing the ocean of worldly life. However, he admits iheir utility for purification of mind. Without purification of mind, it is not possible to achieve progress in spiritual life. It is thus helpful in the initial stage but after one has achieved spirituality, the sacrifices are useless and prove as hindrances. Ramanuja attaches equal importance to sacrifices and knowledge. Knowledge without action and action without knowledge has no value in spiritual life. The *Karma* theory as a theory of actions is very prominent in Jainism. It says that every action affects the soul through body, and it is the cause of worldly bondage. It suggests two ways for encountering the force or influence of *Karma*, by Stoppage[1] and Weeding out.[2] The *Karma* theory is treated in Jainism ethically. Buddhism treats it from the psychological point of view; because it says that the springs of action are desires. To be free from worldly bondage, the desires should be suppressed. The Buddhists are opposed to the Vedic *Karma*. The *Samkhya* observes that the *Karma* is the cause of bondage, which is due to the contact of *Purusha* (soul) with *Prakriti* (Nature). It prescribes that the contact should be entirely cut off by ceasation from work for release from misery. The *Yoga* has a different mode of checking the evils of *Karma* namely, the mode of mind-control. Not that one should refrain from doing action but one's mind should be so disciplined that it refrains from thinking of work of any kind.

Vallabhacharya understands *Karma* in the Vedic sense of a sacrifice. He considers its utility in his *Tattva Dipa Nibandha*.[3]

However he differs from the *Mimansakas* in making it a sole means. Also, he differs from Shankara who gives it a subordinate place in relation to knowledge. He, no doubt, agrees with Ramanuja in giving equal importance to both *Karma* and knowledge, but he gives both of them a place subordinate to devotion.

According to him, a sacrifice is also God's form. It is the revelation of God's power of action or work. Just as God has knowledge-form, so He has a sacrifice-form. All the different kinds of sacrifices mentioned in the Vedas, such as *Agnihotra, Darsha, Purnamasa, Pashu, Chaturmasya* and *Soma*-obligatory or optional and also the materials used for sacrificial ceremony such as a ladle, ghee, rice etc., constitute the form of God.[4] These sacrifices are performed with any of the three motives viz. for the attainment of heaven, for spiritual happiness and for liberation. The sacrifices performed for the fulfilment of desires are called *Vikriti Yagnas*, and their fruit is to lead to heaven but those performed with knowledge of Brahman, lead to liberation which is known as *Karma Mukti*.

---

[1] Samvarana [2] Nirajara. [3] Part II 1-20 [4] Gita IV-24.

Although heaven is mentioned as the fruit of the sacrifices in the Vedas, Vallabhacharya says that the word '*Swarga*' is wrongly interpreted as meaning 'heaven'. It is a word having double sense (i) heaven and (ii) spiritual happiness. The second meaning is understood by deriving the word from the root '*arja*' with a prefix '*Su*', "*Arja*" means 'to get', and '*Su*'–'Good. The whole word means state in which real happiness is achieved-the state that it is of spiritual happiness. The heavenly happiness is only temporary and therefore not worth having. It is enjoyed in heaven so long one's stock of merits is not exhausted, but after that, the soul has to return to this world.

The Gita says that the souls of the performers of the Vedic sacrifices depart after death by the path of smoke, and after reaching their destination come back to the world'.[1] Sacrifices should be performed without any desires or motives. Performers of sacrifices for selfish motives are condemned by the Gita.[2] The Gita lays stress upon the performance of the sacrifiees only for their spiritual value, for increasing spirituality in the soul and not for enjoyment of the so called happiness in heaven. This is the correct interpretation of the world '*Svarga*' according to Vallabhacharya. But he goes still deeper into its significance by asserting that the sacrifices should be performed not for propitiation of Gods, but for God only. They are also a means of God-realisation with knowledge and devotion. He affirms on the authority of the Gita[3] that as God alone is the enjoyer and Lord of all sacrifices, the sacrifice has also spritual value.

Vallabhacharya enumerates nine sub-divisions of Karma performed for fulfilment of desires, according to the tendencies of *Prakriti* (nature) under whose influence the man is urged to do a particalar kind of work. As *Prakriti* is constituted of three *gunas*—Sattva, Rajas and Tamas—the *Karmas* are principally of three kinds—*Sattvika*, (Quietist), *Rajasa* (Active) and *Tamas*[4] (Inert). Each one of these types has three sub-divisions in combination with others. Thus there are 9 types with their goals as under:

---

[1] VIII-24, IX-21. [2] II 42-44. [3].IX-24. [4].The Gita XIII

Kinds of Action	Goals
Sattvika-Sattvika	Heaven
,, -Rajasa	Abode on the mount Meru
,, -Tamasa	The Nether world
Rajasa-Sattvika	The world of Demons
,, -Rajasa	The Moon World
,, -Tamasa	The world of Yakshas
Tamas-Sattvika	The world of Manes
,, -Rajasa	The world of Spirits
,, -Tamasa	The world of Snakes

Performance of actions is obligatory, but it should be discrimiated from Non-work. Every action is not worth doing. Whether it should be done or not, depends upon its internal value. Good action alone is work and bad one is its opposite

Vallabhacharya recognises the worth of *Karma*, depending upon its serviceability in uplifting the soul to divine level. Only those *Karmas* should be done which purify the aspirant's mind and make him fit for devotional life. The chief conditions for doing it are (1) It should be done for the propitation of God without attachment to any fruit. (2) It should be done as God's work, under God's Mandate and should be dedicated to God.

In his *Subodhini* commentary on the Bhagavata, he refers to three kinds of actions (1) Those described in the Vedas. (2) Those in the Pancharatra (3) and those in the Bhagavata. Those described in the Bhagavata are the best.[1] The Vedic *Karmas* are like medicines for curing diseases. They are intended for those who suffer ills of life, blocking up spiritual progress etc.[2] Our actions must teach us our duty to God. They must detach our mind from the world and attach it to God through devotion.[3] *Karma* itself is like poison, but even poison is useful in curing a deadly disease, when mixed with another medicine. In the same way, the actions dedicated to God are helpful in leading a man on the path of devotion to God.[4] Vallabhacharya appreciates the value of *Karma* in a religious life, subject to the above conditions.

Action versus Knowledge

The Vedas teach Action and Knowledge as religious means—action in the *Brahmanas* and knowledge in the Upanishadas.

---

[1] 10-67-26 [2] 11-3-44. [3] 3-23-50 [4] 1-5-33.

These two separate teachings have given rise to two rival schools—One, stressing Action and the other, Knowledge, as a means for a religious life. Jainism and the *Purva Mimansa* advocate supremacy of Action over Knowledge. Badarayana examines this claim[1] and by the following arguments supports the superiority of knowledge over action.

The advocates of action-sacrifice and rituals argue their case as under,

(1) If knowledge were superior to action why should great sages like Vasishtha and others, who reached perfection in the knowledge of *Brahman* have performed sacrifices such as *Agnihotra*? This proves that knowledge is not superior. Need of *Karma* has been admitted for spiritual development even by the great sages, who had acquired knowledge of *Brahman*.[2]

(2) The *Shruti*,[3] illustrates the value of Karma by an example of Janaka, who performed sacrifices. This proves superiority of *Karma* over knowledge. He was very much advanced in knowledge and slill performed sacrifices.[4]

(3) Knowledge[5] should be combined with *Karma* for an ideal religious life.[6] If knowledge were sufficient, as a meaus there would be no need for *Karma*. But in the above *Shriti*, knowledge alone is not deemed sufficient as a means. It requires to be strengthened by *Karma* for the purification of mind.

(4) *Apastamba Sutra*,[7] which is the work on *Karma* lays down that, to be fit for action, knowledge of Brahman is necessary. This means that *Karma* is superior to knowledge, because to be able to perform *Karma*, a spiritual aspirant must pass through a preliminary stage of knowledge. In other words, according to this authority, knowledge is a preparatory stage for the performance of Karma.[8]

(5) There are numerous passages in the scriptures, which prescribe the performance of *Karma* as obligatory for each individual as long as he lives.[9] A man who does not perform a sacrifice and

---

[1] B.S. 3-4-3 to 47. [2] B.S. 2-4-3. [3] Br. U. 3-1-1. [4] B.S. 3-4-44
[5] T.U. 2-1-10, 2-1-15, Gita III-4-8. [6] Br. U.4-4-2. [7] B.S. 3-4-5;
[8] 3-1-1. [9] B.S. 3-4-6.

enjoys his worldly riches is compared with a thief in the Gita (III-12), not only that, but such persons are condemned in the next verse (III-13) as sinful persons. Giving the reason why performance of sacrifices should be regarded obligatory for all men, it says (III-14-15) that men's existence depends upon food which is produced by the rain, but the rain is dependent upon a sacrifice, which is *Karma* as taught in the Vedas, which have originated from God. In the opinion of the Gita, whatever action is done, is an offering to God. Had the Vedas not originated from God, people would not have trusted their teaching for the performance of action and, if people do not perform sacrifices, there would not be rain. So at least for the sustenance of life, people should perform sacrifices and discharge their debt of obligation to God.[1]

Badarayana rules out the claim of the advocates of *Karma* by assigning the following reasons:

(1) Just as there are passages in favour of *Karma*, so there are passages in favour of knowledge also. It means that the Vedas do not consider *Karma* as superior to knowledge. At the most one can say that both *karma* and knowledge deserve equal importance.[2]

(2) No doubt, some knowers of Brahman like Vasishtha have performed sacrifices, but that does not establish the superiority of *Karma* over knowledge. This does not imply that the knowers of Brahman should necessarily perform sacrifices. The example of Vasishtha etc. should be treated as an exceptions.[3] Example of Vasishtha only enhances the value of Karma without proving its superiority.[4]

(3) The example of Janaka is also cited to prove necessity of *Karma*, for men of knowledge, but *Shuka* who was the best of those who reached perfection in knowledge, had nothing to do with *Karma*. So whether a man of knowledge should perform *Karma* or not it depends upon the fitness of the person, and his individual progress. If one is in a sufficiently advanced stage of knowledge, then *Karma* is not indispensable for him.[5]

---

[1] B.S. 3-4-7 [2] B.S. 3-4-9 [3] B.S. 3-4-10 [4] B.S. 3-4-14 [5] B.S. 3-4-11/12

(4) The *Shritis*, instead of laying stress on need of performance of *Karma* have advocated its abandonment[1].

(5) Recluses are exempted from performance of *Karma*. Similarly children and persons, physically unfit, are exempted.[2]

Badarayana proves that *Karma* and knowledge are both equally important. None of them is superior to another. For some persons, performance of rituals is good, for others, only the path of knowledge and for some, both knowlege and rituals. In his opinion, each one is needed as auxiliary to another. Rituals without knowledge or knowledge without rituals is insufficient for spiritual progress. Vallabhacharya also endorses this view, but he says that rituals and knowledge are good in the initial stage, but when sufficient development is attained, they are not helpful. A boy, who seeks admission to a college for higher learning, must pass through a stage of preliminary training in a secondary school of education stage, but after he has passed over the hurdle of that test, he does not require to carry with him his school training. So also in the higher stage of life's progress, Ritual and knowledge are not needed. Vallabhcharya evaluates them only as auxiliaries in the initial stage of devotional life and also appreciates them at their proper value, but does not give them singly or collectively superiority over devotion.

Utility of Action only as purificatory of Mind

The claim of Karma is recognised by Vallabhacharya as a means of purifying the mind, and making one fit for further progress in a religious life. Purification of mind is, however, achieved only by the purity of *Karma*, which depends upon the purity of six factors—wealth, place, time, formula, a priest and the sacrificing person. If any of these is impure, the purity of *Karma* will be affected. In this age which has tendency to materialism, men seek wealth by unfair means, hence money used for sacrifice is very often ill-earned. The place where it is performed is also infested by persons who are immoral, corrupt and non-believers in God. Time is also antagonistic to religious spirit.

---

[1] Narayana Upanishad. 70-5 & B.S. 3-4-33. [2] B.S. 3-4-17.

People have lost faith in God and in the sacred books. The formula by which the ceremony is performed is also mispronounced without preserving tonal effect and the underlying spirit. The priest who performs ceremony does not know his job. He is not well versed in the ritualistic lore. The person performing a sacrifice is a degenerated person, and his motive in performing a sacrifice is not pure, as he performs it for his personal benefits. So all these factors, on which the performance of a sacrifice depends, have lost their purity in the present age. It being so, *Karma,* even though performed, has no value in our religious life, strictly speaking as it is not *Karma,* in consonance with its spirit of the scriptures. It is its semblance.

Vallabhacharya repudiates the Jain theory of *Karma.* Jainism does not believe in God. *Karma* takes the place of God in this system. It believes that *Karma* is a source of fruit by itself. There is no need of God. This is not true. If *Karma* by itself is able to produce its fruit, how is it that a man who puts the best of efforts in his work, does not succeed in the achievement of his object? A farmer works hard in his field, sows best of seeds, but his hopes of raising good crops are foiled on account of want of rain. A man works laboriously day and night with best of his intellectual powers, to execute his plan but the result is failure. This means that the fruit of our action is in the hands of God. The work is inherently destitute of the power of yielding fruit. Badarayana also lends support to this[1] view. The Gita explaining the importance of *Karma* says[2] that *Karma* fades away before knowledge.[3] The Gita compares knowledge with fire and *Karmas* with fuel sticks and says that just as fire consumes fuel sticks, so knowledge consumes the *Karmas.* Vallabhacharya accepts it as an aid to spiritual life in the initial stage, as a means for God-realisation. He rejects Vedic *Karma* as a means but he does not reject *Karma* (work) done for God. He accepts the Gita idea of Karma that it is to be done selflessly, only for God's sake. *Karma* has its place in the spiritual and divine life, but it is subordinate to knowledge and devotion. As an independent means, it is good for nothing. If it is to be serviceable, it must play a second fiddle to knowledge or devotion.

---

[1] B.S. 3-3-1. [2] IV-33. [3] IV-37.

Knowledge:

The individual souls are separated from God by His will and become embodied souls, suffering bondage according to T.U., but through knowledge, they acquire fitness for restoration to God. The soul must know its real nature viz. it is the essence of God and does not belong to this world, but to God. God does not wish that the soul should be attached to worldly pleasures or hanker after heavenly happiness, which will keep him permanently in the state of worldly bondage. For release from it, the soul should seek knowledge of its relation to God. By knowledge, he will understand that the world with its pleasures is a vanity fair and that, though outwardly it is a bed of roses, actually it is a bed of thorns.

Vallabhacharya recognises knowledge as a necessary means for spiritual life. According to him, knowledge is a form and a power of God. The Gita admits its usefulness by saying that even the most sinful men will cross over all sins by the boat of knowledge. Just as a boat is necessary and useful for crossing the ocean, so knowledge is necessary and useful for the purification of the mind. This knowledge is necessary only for the peace of mind.[1] But the idea of knowledge in the Gita relates to the knowledge of the greatness of God and the relation of the souls to God. In chapters VII to VIII the Gita describes the greatness of God by asserting that God is a material and efficient cause, and that He is manifested in all visible forms and mental activities or states. Predominent personalities known as Vibhutis are also His forms. He is present in all and yet transcends them. The knowledge which is necessary for soul's union with God is the knowledge of God's greatness. Vallabhacharya accepts this ideal of knowledge of the Gita. It is also the Upanishadic idea and that of the Brahma Sutras. The Gita has mentioned two forms of Brahman—*Akshara* and *Purushottama*; the Akshara to be attained by knowledge only and *Purushottama* by devotion. Vallabhacharya's concept of Supreme God is *Purushottama* or Krishna. He therefore means that knowledge which enables one to reach *Purushottama* is essential.

The Buddhistic idea of knowledge does not appeal to him, because although it can end nescience, it cannot conduce to happiness. It is a goalless negative way for spiritual development and cannot become a means of God-realisation by itself. To the Buddhists, knowledge is momentary, but Vallabhacharya believes it permanent and identifies it with God's power. The Samkhya view also is not acceptable to him· because, though knowledge makes one free from worldly misery, but what about happiness? Again in that system, knowledge is not related to God. It takes *Prakriti* as the ultimate Reality, instead of God. The *Naiyayikas* recommend rational knowledge, but Vallabhacharya trusts only the scriptures in the matter of knowledge about God. The Vaisheshikas teach knowledge of seven categories—Materials, Qualities, Actions, Universality, Particularity, Inherence and Negation. But this system, like the Naiyayika school regards God only as an efficient cause and not as the material cause. The relation of the souls to God is not explained.

---

[1] IV-39.

To Shamkara, the best advocate of knowledge theory, knowledge is the very form or essence of Brahman, but he has misread the holy works, by declaring only Brahman as real and the souls as unreal. If embodied souls are unreal, how is it that, by means of knowledge, they can realise their aspiration of reintegration with Brahman? Again his theory that the world and all things that are in the world are unreal, renders his knowledge theory futile, because the knowledge, souls, the scriptures and preceptors are in the world and therefore would be unreal. If knowledge is not real, what good will come out of it? According to him, the goal of knowledge is liberation, by which he means identification with or absorption in Brahman. If that is the goal, it is not a positive means by which the soul can be restored to God in its divine form and enjoy God's bliss.

Ramanuja's idea of knowledge is better than that of Shamkara but his "knowledge" has no value; unless it is combined with action. He accepts combination of knowledge and action and calls it worship or devotion. Ramanuja fails to demarcate knowledge from devotion.

Vallabhacharya's theory of knowledge is based upon the Veda. A knower, a knowable object and knowledge, all these are the forms of God. Knowledge is a link by which the knower and the knowable object are brought together. Shamkara does not recognise the knowers and knowable objects as real. He says that only knowledge is real; because what is known as knowledge is Brahman. But Vallabhacharya does not accept this. He says the knowers, the knowables and knowledge all are real, because they are all God's forms. Just as God is knowledge so also He is a knower and a knowable object. Unless God is a knower and is a knowable object, God's knowledge which is in essence God Himself, will not be revealed to us. So, according to Vallabhacharya, the aim of knowledge is not the removal of ignorance only but the realisation of God. Even the so-called misapprehensions, errors or cases of wrong knowledge are real, because of God's presence in them, although it is not apprehended by a knower, on account of defective intellect for a God-seeker.

Shamkara maintains that the knowledge of "Thou art That" is real knowledge. But Vallabha disagrees with him. He says (1) the Upanishada in which this sentence occurs, does not teach identification of Brahman with the soul, it rather teaches non-difference of the world and the souls with Brahman. Shamkara lays unnecessary stress on this sentence. (2) His interpretation of that sentence is not correct. There is no identity but likeness of the soul with God. (3) Mere knowing that sentence verbally, cannot be useful in realising God. It may help in controlling the mind, but cannot protect against bodily diseases. (4) If verbal knowledge can help realisation of Brahman, one could see before him, an elephant simply by hearing his trumpeting. By hearing it, one can know that it is the sound of the elephant, but cannot perceive the elephant before him. To perceive the elephant, one has to see the elephant with his eyes because seeing is the function of the eyes and not of the ears. In the same way, mere verbal knowledge of 'Thou art that' cannot enable one to realise Brahman. If knowledge cannot be instrumental in the realisation of God, it is worthless.

Vallabhacharya, though rejects Shamkara's ideal of knowledge, he accepts its efficacy in forward march of spiritual life because it teaches one to renounce the world and devote life to it alone for liberation. Efficacy of knowledge in spiritual development is emphasised by him in several places in his *Subodhini*-Commentary on the Bhagavata. Some important references are noted below:—

(1) The Knowledge of the Vedas without understanding the meaning is useless.[1]

(2) Unless knowledge, acquired by understanding is perfected by reflection it does not become effective.[2]

(3) Of the three kinds of knowledge-self-knowledge, philosophical knowledge of the *Tattvas*, and the knowledge of God, the last is the best, because all these, no doubt, lead to *Dharma* and *Vairagya* (Detachment); but the last one alone is the cause of God-realisation.

(4) One acquires knowledge only when there is intense longing for God and suffers pangs of separation from God for it.[3]

(5) The value of knowledge lies in the purification of the mind.

(6) Perfect knowledge alone becomes a means for the realisation of Brahman.[4]

(7) Until God is realised, even knowledge is ignorance.

(8) Glory of knowledge is a triumph over one's nature.[5]

(9) Knowing that, God is everywhere and in everything, is knowledge. Not only knowledge of jar etc., is real, but even the knowledge of the horns of a hare or of the sky flowers is real, because the jars and the sky flowers are God's forms. If it is not so, they will not become objects of cognition.

(10) Only one who is unaffected by the qualities—(*gunas* of *Prakkriti*) is fit for knowledge. Not by knowing scriptures only; but by conquering one's own nature[6] one becomes a knower.

(11) The knowledge of self is like the husks of rice, and the knowledge of God is like rice. Those who wish to appease hunger will take rice and not the husks. Just as the cooked rice, and not husks contribute to health; in the same way, the knowledge of self is necessary nourishment for healthy soul.[7]

(12) The knowledge that, 'I am Brahman' cannot help the God seeker to get rid of worldly bondage. Only the knowledge

---

[1] Bh. S. 1-10-23. [2] Bh. S. 57-12-21. [3] Bh. S. 1-12-10. [4] Bh. S. 3-4-8
[5] Bh. S. 8-1-2. [6] Bh. S. 3-4-31. [7] Bh. S. 10-14-4.

that 'All is God' is helpful in getting rid of worldly bondage.[1]

(13) Liberation is impossible by knowledge; because its existence is only for three moments. It is not permanent. When knowledge disappears *Prakriti* starts its operation, and subjects the God-seeker to worldly sufferings. Such a knowledge is not worth seeking.[2]

(14) Knowledge whose goal is the absorption in Brahman and not the union with God or participation in the bliss of God is not of supreme value.[3]

(15) Knowledge unrelated to God has no purificatory value.[4]

(16) Knowledge is constituted of three elements—the object to be known, the organs, and the mind. All these must be pure.[5]

(17) First, one should get knowledge of the greatness of God and then know the real nature of God. Such knowledge can purify the soul.[6]

(18) Just as rice becomes fit for eating when cooked, so the soul that becomes perfect by knowledge, becomes fit for liberation i. e. the state of Union with God.[7]

(19) The purpose of knowledge is achieved, when a knowable object is known. The only object which is knowable is Brahman.[8]

(20) Knowledge of any kind must be adorned by devotion. A doll of gold, unless decked by an ornament, has no attraction. Knowledge by itself has no intrinsic brilliancy. Devotion serves the purpose of an ornament and adds beauty to it. So knowledge requires devotion for its brilliancy.[9]

Vallabhacharya's attitude towards knowledge in general is based upon the Gita. Like the Gita, he admits two categories of Knowledge (1) Theoretical known as *Jnana* or Knowing (2) Practical known as *Vijnana* or Experience (IX-1). Theoretical knowledge is derived from the scriptures, while the practical is dependent upon God's will. By practical knowledge, one seeks God and feels Him in one's own heart.

---

[1] Bh.S. 10-14-24.
[2] Bh. S. 3-27-38
[3] Bh.S. 10-U-2-54-55.
[4] Bh.S. 10-23-14-2.
[5] Bh.S. 10-7-21.
[6] Bh.S. 10-8-K-4.
[7] Bh.S. 10-13-42.
[8] Bh.S. 2-5-16.
[9] Bh.S. 1-5-12.

According to Vallabhacharya there are four divisions of knowledge (1)(a) *Laukika*—worldly knowledge got by senses and mind, through perception, inference, the word testimony etc. and (b) *Alaukika* — Not worldly. This has three sub-divisions. (2) Knowledge of *Akshara* whose goal is absorption in Brahman (3) and Knowledge mixed with devotion to God. This is *Maryada* knowledge leading to liberation of the kind such as Proximity to God, Acquiring powers of God, Residence with God etc. (4) Knowledge of God's Bliss or Love-form with its goal-union with God for participation in His Bliss. This is for *Pushti* souls.

The Gita[1] says that if a devotee wants to realise God, his devotion must be preceded by the knowledge of God.

He should know the real nature of God in his transcendental aspect which is perfect bliss or love. Without this knowledge, the devotee does not acquire fitness for participation in God's Bliss. This knowledge is not the knowledge of the scriptures, it comes by devotion or love-experience of Gcd. The T.U. says that the soul attains Supreme God after this knowledge of the love form of God.[2] A knower of Brahman attains Supreme Brahman i.e God in His Bliss form. By the knowledge of the scriptures, one can know *Akshara* and not Supreme God, who is perfect Bliss or Love. The stage of the knowledge of Supreme God is the next stage in sequence, after the stage of knowledge when Brahman is to be known, not by the scriptures, but by devotion or love through experience. In this stage, the soul knows that Supreme God is higher than *Akshara.* It therefore turns away from *Akshara,* and directs its mind etc. to God's love. According to Vallabhacharya, knowledge has to be sought only as a means to God-realisation.

Agaiu knowledge has twofold functions, (1) the increase of spirituality and (2) the advance in devotional life, whose aim is God-realisation. The marks of knowledge for spirituality are mentioned in the Gita,[3] viz. absence of pride, freedom from hypocrisy, non-violence, forgiveness, straightforwardness, service of the preceptor, purity of mind and body, steadfastness, self-control, absence of egoism, non-attachment to the world, equipoise, unflinching devotion to God etc.

---

[1] XVIII-55. [2] Brahmavid Apnoti Param. [3] XIII 7-20.

These marks of knowledge constitute *Vidya.* They have been mentioned by Vallabhacharya in *Tattva Dipa Nibandha* (1-45) namely, detachment from the world and attachment to God, abandonment of desires except desire for God, withdrawal of mind from the world and focussing it on God, austerity i.e. suffering pangs of separation from God and devotion (Love for God). This kind of knowledge makes the soul fit for union with God. A piece of wood no doubt has fire latent in it; but unless it is brought out by ignition process by its contact with fire, the wood cannot give us service in cooking etc. where fire is most needed. So, without the knowledge of God, the union with Him is not possible. By knowledge, the soul will know its relation to God, and will turn Godwards. Then worldliness will completely wear out and divinity will shine out in its full glory. A ball of iron is cold, but when heat is applied to it, the whole ball will be filled with heat, so, when God enters the soul through knowledge, which is God's power, it becomes God-like, by acquiring the God-state. It is this knowledge, which finds place in Vallabhacharya's system, as a second fiddle to devotion.

Devotion (Bhakti):

In Vallabhacharya's system *Bhakti* is a supreme means for God-realisation. He has explained the nature of devotion and its phases in his work '*Bhakti Vardhini.*' His son Vitthaleshji has written two independent treatises, '*Bhakti Hetu*' and '*Bahkti Hansa*' establishing its superiority over all other means. Yogi Gopishvara has proved its superiority as a means of God-realisation by numberless quotations from various texts of the scriptures in his Magnum Opus '*Bhakti Martanda*' (The Sun of Devotion). Besides the above works, there are many works in the Vallabha school in which devotion is preferred to other means.

Pushtimarga or the Path of Grace of God:

Vallabhacharya's *Bhakti Marga* is known as *Pushti Marga* as distinguished from *Maryada Marga.* In the *Pushti Marga, Bhakti* is not a means, but an end. It is supreme love for God, for God's love. In *Maryada Marga, Bhakti* is a means and very often it is attended with knowledge. The goal of *Pushti Bhakti* is attainment of the Supreme God, who is Bliss and Love, and that of

Maryada Bhakti is liberation. *Pushti Bhakti* is dependent upon God only. *Maryada Bhakti* depends upon one's own efforts.

There are two main devisions of Bhakti (1) Bhakti as a means and (2) Bhakti as an end. The first is called *Sadhana Rupa* or *Maryada Bhakti,* having nine forms viz. listening to the glorious deeds of God from the scriptures and holy men etc. (*Shravanna*), reciting God's glorious names or praises (*Kirtana*), remembering God's glorious lilas (Deeds) (*Smarana*), offering salutation to God's image (*Vandana*), worshipping God (*Archana*), falling prostrate at the feet of God's image (*Padasevana*), the state of a servant through humility and service of God (*Dasya*), friendly relation with God, believing God as a friend (*Sakhya*), self-dedication to God (*Atmanivedana*). The first kind of *Bhakti* is known as the devotion of a nine—fold nature (*Navadha.*) (2) The second type is called *Premalakshana Bhakti.* It is unalloyed and selfless supreme love for God. This is called *Pushti Bhakti.*

Definitions of Bhakti

Historically there are two earliest works, defining the nature and functions of Devotion viz. the *Bhakti Sutras* of *Shandilya* and the sutras by *Narada.* Both are staunch advocates of the Bhakti doctrine in preference to other means. Both assert supremacy of devotion, but they differ slightly in their definitions of Bhakti.

According to *Narada,* devotion is supreme and the most acute love for God, preceeded by the knowledge of the greatness of God. According to *Shandilya,* it is incessant love for God. *Narada* makes knowledge of the greatness of God as a pre-requisite condition. Bhakti is no doubt supreme love for God, but he believes that without the knowledge of God's greatness, through the scriptures, that God is a material and an efficient cause and is manifested as the world and the souls; God's real nature will not be comprehended, and in the absence of comprehension, it is not possible that one can love God. According to this definition, the relation of knowledge to love is like that of a foundation to an edifice. If an edifice is to be strong, it must stand on a solid foundation. Devotion also likewise supported by knowledge will be firm and unshaken under all situations of life.

Shandilya does not attach any conditions to devotion. It is a spontaneous emotion of love for God. It is like a flow of a stream, bursting out from the mountain and flowing towards the sea, incessantly, unobstructed by any interruptions in its way. The stream in the beginning is narrow, but its dimension goes on increasing till it meets the ocean. Bhakti is such love for God.

Vallabhacharya accepts both these definitions in his '*Tattva Dipa Nibandha*'. But he says that the *Sadhana Rupa Bhakti* is intended for the devotees who are in the *Maryada* state. They should first seek knowledge of God's greatness, comprehend God's nature and resort to Nine-fold devotion. When the *Atmanivedana* state is reached, it will be easy for them to discard worldly things and love God. The only means, then, is pure love of God, which is defined by Shandilya as supreme incessant love (*Paranurakti*). It is love for God, qualified by two adjectives-'supreme' and 'uninterrupted' or ceaseless love. It is the love which is above all other loves and does not tolerate a break even for a second. This type is illustrated by an example of the Gopis,-the cowherdesses of Gokula, who gave up all worldly pleasures, pursuits and lived only for the love of God Krishna. They were simple girls without any knowledge, but they had love for Krishna as Supreme God.

Shandilya differentiates devotion (love) from knowledge by under mentioned assertions.

(1) A man of love bears no hatred for anyone, but a man of knowledge is rarely free from hatred. So knowledge and love are not one.[1]

(2) When love dawns, knowledge ceases to function; but the dawning of knowledge cannot stop love's operation.[2]

(3) Knowledge depends upon one's own efforts but love is the gift of God.[3]

(4) Knowledge is a means of liberation; but love is not a means. It is an end by itself.

(5) The goal of knowledge is immortality or liberation; while that of love is enjoyment of God's bliss

Distinguishing love from *Yoga*, (mind-control) Shandilya says that the aim of *Yoga* is release from the worldly state through mind-control or by meditation. Its utility lies only in getting a tranquil state of mind. It cannot help in enabling the soul to acquire God-state and participate with God in that state. According to him, the purport of the Brahma Sutras is to establish superiority of love over knowledge.

---

[1] S.B.S. 4, [2] S.B.S. 5. [3] S.B.S. 7,

Vallabhacharya bases his conception of devotion on the above two authorities, but he favours devotion of pure love-type. It is to be got by God's grace. Only elect souls can get it as God's gift. Those who have love for God, do not recognise any worldly ties. They are not attached to worldly loves. Even if they have worldly loves of any kind, they regard them as a means for reaching God's love. They live for God's love only. Although their bodies are in the world, their mind and senses are turned towards God. This love of God is their all-their religion, wealth, pleasure and release. In his *Subodhini* commentary, Vallabhacharya attaches following conditions to devotion.

(1) It must be spontaneous and motiveless[1] and uninterrupted.[2]

(2) It must mollify the heart,[3] so that it may feel for God.

(3) It is expressed through service of God with love, not merely passive love.[4]

(4) It is independent of knowledge. In the state of suffering pangs of separation from God, even remembrance of God's glories, is deemed as an obstruction to the experiencing of God's love (*Nirodha Lakshana*).

(5) Its aim is God's happiness.[5]

(6) It does not recognise barriers of caste, creed or colour.

(7) It is independent of time or place. Any time or place is favourable to its expression.

(8) It requires complete engagement of all our senses and mind in God.

(9) It cannot have its rise in the heart of a man filled with pride.[6]

(10) Sexual love or lust paralyses Bhakti. It is like poison in a milk-pot and is inimical to Dharma.[7]

(11) If there is pure love, no conformity to the scriptures is necessary. Even transgression of scriptural prescriptions or ethical rules do not come in the way of God's grace.

---

[1] S.B.S. 256. [2] Bh.S. 3-29-12. [3] Bh.S. 3-28-34. [4] Bh.S. 3-29-12.
[5] Bh.S. 3-25-41. [6] Bh.S. 3-5-43. [7] Bh.S. 10-8-50.

Here are given below some important points according to Vallabhacharya for the superiority of love-type of devotion:—

(1) It does not require any means like knowledge

(2) There are no pitfalls in the path of devotion, if once the soul is accepted by God as His own.

(3) It imparts a sense of security and absolute fearlessness. A devotee regards God as his protector in all concerns and situations of life.

(4) It is open to all classess. Even women and the downtroddon Shudras are qualified for admission to it.

(5) Its goal is neither worldly happiness, nor paradisical exaltation, nor even liberation but only enjoyment of God's love in union with Him.

(6) It does not require the devotee to give up life of a householder and turn a recluse. He may stay in the world and experience God through service and love, even as a householder.

(7) It is not obligatory for a devotional life that desires should be suppressed. It stresses the need that our desires should be sublimated and turned to God.

(8) Bhakti does not make one hate the world as unreal. To the devotee, the world is God's creation, manifested for His *Lila*.

(9) It is selfless. The devotee does not seek his personal good. His only good is God's love.

(10) It is not fraught with difficulties like work and knowledge. Anybody can resort to it.

(11) It is absolute trust in God, so a devotee preserves his composure of mind in the midst of any cares or anxieties or worldly troubles.

(12) In devotion, we transcend ourself. In whatever we do, we do not think in terms of our own self, but with reference to God. We love God for His own sake; and our world and our self for the sake of God.

(13) In knowledge, when the goal is reached, the entity of the individual soul is lost, but in devotion it is preserved in tact. The soul participates in God's bliss as a separate entity in full glory.

Growth of Devotion: The love or devotion must grow from more to more. The way of its growth is indicated in Vallabhacharya's work, '*Bhaktivardhini.*' It must grow from more to more till it reaches its climax when the devotee's desire for God-realisation is fulfilled by God Himself. It has three phases. The first phase is simply known as love which is turning to God, disregarding all earthly loves. It is an attraction to God. In its second phase, it is attachment. Now it is not simply attraction of God, but attachment to Him so that the soul will find all happiness in God and not in the world. In the third condition, the soul feels its intense longing for union with God and suffers unbearable pangs of separation. At this stage, God reveals Himself to the devotee and blesses him with eternal bliss of non-separation and enjoyment of His love, the soul having now been completely transformed into divine essence.

The love-type of devotion is a stage higher than the nine-fold type devotion mentioned above. Although the love-type is a distinct type, it does not mean that it is opposed to the nine-fold type. The only difference between the two is that in the nine-fold type, love is latent, and in the love-type, it is patent. The love-type devotion is derived from the nine-fold, which marks the embryonic condition of love. Love follows Self-Dedication. Self-Dedication may be regarded as a soil into which the seed of love is cast. It ultimately grows, blossoms and flowers into the loveliest plant of devotion. It is a law of vegetable life, that if the seed is not very strong, the plant will not be strong. The soil, the seed and favourable rain are the three necessary conditions for the growth of a good plant. In the same way, the growth of Devotion depends upon self-dedication, love and God's grace. After the plant sprouts forth, it requires continuous sprinkling of water for its nourishment; so devotion also has to be nourished, by renunciation, non-attachment to the world, listening to and reciting God's praises. But to ensure the soundness or the potentiality of the seed, so that the plant growing out of it will be the strongest; the inviolable and the best one; some kind of ceremony has to be gone through. This is known as *Brahma Sambandha* ceremony. The ceremony by which the soul, separated from God for thousands of years, acquires fitness for restoration to union with God. It is a declaration of a vow of loyalty to God, on the part of a devotee. Since the devotee accepts God as his master, ruler and protector; it is his duty to dedicate everything of his own to God. This vow is absolutely necessary for the follower of the *Pushti Marga* before his admission to it. It is a vow, not only of allegiance to God but also of declaring the devotee's full trust in God, both as his protector and a lover. This vow is taken by a formula: "Krishna, I am your servant." This is to be preceded by a *Mantra* (Formula) "Lord Krishna is my refuge". This *Mantra* prepares the soul for its upward rise from spirituality to divinity. It teaches the soul to give up all trust in its own efforts and rely on God alone. It gives sufficient strength to the soul to resist against all temptations and worldly evils, and makes it fearless in all worldly transactions.

The second formula makes the souls conscious of their relation to God and reminds the devotee constantly that he belongs not to the world, but to God alone and therefore everything that he possesses is not his own, but God's. He is only God's humble servant and as such, he has no right to use his worldly possessions for his own pleasure. They should be dedicated to God and it should be left to God to make him use them in anyway He pleases. This vow of consecration was introduced by Vallabhacharya at the command of *Lord Srinathji*-the Glorious and the Beautiful God. It is recorded in the life of Vallabhacharya that reading the signs of time under the Muslim regim once his mind was extremely puzzled as to how to bring back the divine souls to God in that age, since all means for a religious life had not proved efficacious, due to adverse environments—social, political and religious. In the domain of religion, hypocrisy had very much rampant. The holy places had lost their sanctity. The scriptures were neglected by the followers of Hindu Faith. The learned made use of their learning in carrying on disputes. Religious practices were performed only for selfish motives. Those who knew the scriptures were proud of their learning. Their knowledge was not used for spiritual development. The paths of *Karma* and *Gnana* became difficult for ordinary people. Men's minds were not easy and free from distractions. The old edifice of Hinduism was threatening to totter down under the onslanghts of foreign civilisation. Hindu religion lost its solidarity, and was divided into many sects. It had not been only disorganised but had degenerated, and was on the verge of complete disruption. Vallabhacharya thought of the condition of the people in general and of the means of bringing them to a true religious life. His heart, was brimful of compassion for the highest kinds of souls, whom he saw shrouded by clouds of gloom and darkness of despair and despondency. He spent several days and nights to find out the way for their rescue and restoration to God. He studied and pondered on the Upanishads, the Gita, the Brahmasutras, and the Bhagavata to find the way, and at last it came to his knowledge. It was on the 11th day of the bright fortnight of the month of *Shravana* during the night, that he had the revelation of Lord Krishna face to face, who admonished him the way for the uplift of the divine souls by means of this *Mantra*-the only way of surrender to God. Union of the *Pushti* souls with God is to initiate them by a formula of *Brahma Sambandha,* finally stating 'Oh krishna, I am your servant'. This is a formula originally in Sanskrit consisting of nearly 84 letters. It is for establishing the union of the souls with God, from whom it is separated and suffers worldly bondage.

The *Mantra* in the formula-form is Vallabhacharya's own invention, though the idea contained in it is derived from the Gita and the Bhagavata Purana. It was there in both the above sacred works, in a crude and inchoate form but its value and significance were not noticed by others before Vallabhacharya. The formula reminds the devotee of his connection with God, that his soul is a portion of God and that it belongs to Him, that it makes him conscious of the fact that his goal of life is God alone and that he must not be attached to worldly relations, but engage them in the service of God. Repetition of this vow will make one free from all kinds of sins, viz natural sins due to the superimposition of the self on the vital breath, the sins arising from place due to the superimposition of the self of the body, the sins of contact due to superimposition of the self on the internal organ-mind, the sins of touch due to the superimposition of the self for the senses and the time, and the sins due to the forgetfulness of the self of its essential nature. Purification of the body, senses, vital breath and the mind, and establishing contact of the soul with God is the chief purpose of this formula. The soul, by it, will know that it belongs to God and that all that it possesses is not its, but God's, and so that must be used for God's service. The sins from which the uttering of this formula grants immunity are named in the "*Siddhanta Rahasya*".

The vow of consecration is to be administered by the preceptor at the time of initiation before the idol of God. In the sect of Vallabhacharya it is conventional to receive this *Mantra* from a descendant of Vallabhacharya as his representative. In the famous Maharaja Libel case, it was deliberately misrepresented by interested parties, on the plea that the dedication is made to the priest and not to God. The very words of the formula with its explanatory portion, known as *Gadya Mantra*, is clear on this point for those who want to understand it. There is not even the remotest indication pointing to the idea that the dedication is intended to the priest. On the contrary the words in the dative "*Krishnaya*" (To Lord Krishna) and "*Bhagavate*" (to God) are sufficient to prove that the dedication is to be made to God Krishna. Its translation in English is given below.

"Thousands of years have elapsed since my (soul's) separation from God. I am suffering intense pain and anguish in hope of meeting God. In this condition of separation I am joyless, therefore, I take a vow of consecration and dedicate my body, organs, vital breath, mind and their functions, also my wife, children, house, relatives, wealth and merits of this world and of the next world along with my soul, to Lord Krishna, who is all powerful and possessed of all qualities such as greatness, potentiality, glory, beauty, knowledge and bliss. Oh Krishna, I am your servant."

There is widespread misunderstanding about the nature of this dedication among both western and eastern scholars, and even among educated Indians.

Perhaps, it is likely that this misunderstanding and misinterpretation might have wrongly originated from wrong translation of certain observations of Shri Gokulnathji, the illustrious grand son of Shri Vallabhacharya who in his commentary of *Siddhanta Rahasya* elucidates it as under:

"Therefore, before that, before appropriating anything to one's use, all things have to be at first dedicated to God only, including wife and son. After marriage one's wife is to be dedicated i.e. consecrated for God's service, before commencement of the house—holder's life. After the birth of children they, too, are to be dedicated. To avoid misinterpretation, it is clarified that, this dedication means only the declaration made before the idol of God for His service."

Shri Gokulnathji in his commentary has advisedly used the word "*Upabhoga*"[1] and while elucidating its meaning, has used the word "*Upayoga*" in the next line, whereby a general appropriation to one's use is meant, and not enjoyment in the sense of any degrading sexual act.

More explicitly, by dedication, one's all belongings, the house, wealth, property, wife, sons, daughters, and one's self also are to be used for the service of God as represented by the image which is installed in his house by the devotee and not for enjoyment.

We fail to see how any carnality or sexuality can be attributed or derived from this simple, universal and one of the purest forms of genuine devotion and piety.

Wherever any religion teaches the dissolution or eradication of the human ego, this is at once, the most effective, the simplest and the most direct method of achieving the same. It needs hardly to be emphasised that dedication or offering to God is an oral, as well as a mental vow. There can never be or has never been any suggestion or hint of physical, let alone any carnal relationship.

Of course, the *Guru* is present at the time of taking a vow of dedication; but he dedicates the disciple (including all his belongings) to God and God alone, and to none else.

It is preposterous to read into this pure and simple ceremony, anything that savours of human relationship.

---

[1] *Tasmadadu Swopabhogat Purvamewva Sarvavastu Paden Bharyaputradinamapi Samarpanam Kartavyam. Vivahantaram Swopayogatpurvameva Tannivedanam Kartyavym. Evamapi Putrotpattyantaramapi Putradinam Samarpanam Kartavyam*
तस्मादादौ स्वोपभोगात्पूर्वमेव सर्ववस्तू पदेन भार्यापुत्रादीनामपि समर्पणं कर्तव्यम् । विवाहान्तरं स्वोपयोगात्पूर्वमेव तन्निवेदनं कर्तव्यम् । एवमपि पुत्रोत्पत्त्यनन्तरमपि पुत्रादीनां समर्पणं कर्तव्यम् ।।

All great teachings and reformatory movements tend to degenerate because of the human material through which it has to work, and as it happens everywhere, the teaching (truth) gets mixed up by mis-interpretations, either through ignorance or through the inherent weakness of human nature. And that is why Shri Vallabhacharya in his last message to humanity has warned in unmistakable terms against the danger of the outward-going tendencies of senses (the human mind).

It is the duty of the scholars, who want to think impartialy and to do justice to any school of philosophy, to study either the original standard works or trustworthy translations, the doctrines propounded by the founder and the standard commentaries thereon by reputed scholars, who are well versed and conversant with the teaching.

It is unfortunate that half-baked scholars, with preconceived ideas, get hold of certain second-hand unreliable writings, rely on isolated stray practices, which in no way reflect the original teaching. (which are gross perversions of the original teaching).

This vow of consecration is supposed to strengthen the seed of love, without which love cannot have its growth. It is a preliminary stage to prepare the soul for onward journey to the goal of God-realisation, through increase of devotion, taking its rise from love and reaching culmination point in the soul's state of desolation (Vyasana).

The officiating priest is like a priest who performs the marriage ceremony on behalf of a bride and bridegroom. He unites the two in a nuptial. The soul is a bride and God a bridegroom. The soul forgets its, relation to God in the worldly state. The *Brahma-Sambandha* ceremony reminds the soul of its relation to God and of its duty of service, by which it expresses its faith and trust in God and acknowledges God's mastery over it completely. It is the declaration of the devotee before God, not to disregard His will, in weal and woe.

The significance of the vow of consecration is explained by P. Johanns in his book on 'Vallabha'[1] in the following words, 'And by his consecration, the soul escapes from the self and the wrong of its own construction and from all the wrong superimpositions of the self on the body'. Henceforth, the devotee puts himself absolutely under the care and protection of God and regards all his possessions as God's possessions. His ownership is transferred to God.

---

[1] P. 54.

The vow of consecration is obligatory for all those who seek admission to the Path of God's Grace. It is not, however, that all who have taken this vow are entitled to God's Grace at once. It depends upon God's will. All persons admitted to this path are not qualified for being worthly af God's grace. Only the highest kinds of the souls *Pushti pushti* are deemed worthy of God's Grace.

Vallabhacharya notes three sub-divisions of the Pusthi souls:—(1) *Pravahi*-inferior worldly souls (2) the *Maryada*-spiritual Middling souls (3) *Pushti*-The Superior, Divine souls. The *Pushti* souls are so called; because they all seek God's love and grace. Their goal is the same, but there are differences in their way, due to differences in dispositions. The householders belong to the first category. They are engaged in worldly pursuits, and cannot easily disentangle themselves from it although in their heart, they feel love for God. They have responsibilities of a family-life. Again their worldly circumstances are not favourable to them, to enable them to cut off the entire connection with the world and be devoted to God, for the love for God. Such devotees are advised by Vallabhacharya to remain in the world and do their duties as prescribed by the society, as well as the scriptures, without any attachment. They should practise devotion of the nine-fold type, towards Krishna remembering that they have to do their worldly duties under God's will and for God's sake. Their daily service to God will develop the love seed which is latent in them and make it sprout forth as a plant. But they should not let their minds be engrossed in or distracted by worldly pursuits. If the environments of the family life are favourable to them, they should engage themselves in the service of God and in practising the nine-fold devotion, such as listening to God's praises or *Lilas* etc. But if the environments are not favourable, they should only practise nine-fold devotion, till the love-seed emerges in the form of *prema* or *Sneha* for God. Whether they should stay at home in the midst of the members of their families or avoid them and stay in a place, away from them, depends upon their circumstances. It is they, who are to choose, but one thing is certain, whether they stay at home or away from it, they should be careful to avoid distractions of any kind, which will disturb their devotion.

As for the *Pushti Maryada* devotees of the second category, it is incumbent on them that they should avoid the worldly connection, leave their homes and make their residence in secluded places, like a place of pilgrimage, where they will not be in any danger of distractions. Vallabhacharya does not recommend the renunciation of an ascetic type; for, such renunciation is fraught with many possibilities of risks and pitfalls, due to intercourse with wicked persons, bad food and sinister influence of the world. According to him, the purpose of renunciation is achieved by the devotee's stay at a holy place, remote from worldly men, free from any distractions, and alone in a company of a few true devotees.

The highest or *Pushti* devotees have not to go through the above discipline. They have no hurdles to pass over on their way. Their way to God is straight and smooth. Their only guide is God. They move on undistractedly and fearlessly, trusting in God's guidance. They are free from worldly obligations, family ties and social duties. They have no dependents to look after, nor do they depend upon any one except God. Their devotion is *Shuddha Bhakti* or *Pure Pushti.* This *Bhakti* has three stages during its growth (1) love. (2) attachment and (3) desolation.

The first stage of love commences from its attraction to God. It presupposes destruction of the passionate or sexual love otherwise known as concupiscence. Just as appearance of light at dawn synchorises with the disappearance of darkness, so, the rising of love for God synchorises with the disappearance of concupiscence. During this state, the soul shows inclination to turn away from the love of the self and for the world, and feels attraction towards God. The self-love and the the world-love is now replaced by God's love. Just as a piece of iron is attracted towards a magnate by the force of the magnate, so the soul is attracted by God's love. This is the first step in God-realisation or experiencing God's love. The mind is now possessed by

Krishna. The devotee's thoughts are only about God and he experiences no other emotion except love for God. When love develops into attachment which is a higher plane in love-experience, it is characterised simultaneously by complete detachment from the world and attachment to God. Love is only attraction to God, but attachment is more than that. It is a desire to remain permanently with God. This attachment is so powerful that no worldly persuasions or influences can deter the soul from God's love. Its characteristic mark is disgust for family life and for the whole world. All his love for the family is transferred to God. He loves family life for the sake of God. Although he loves the members of his family, he is not attached to them. By his love to them, he makes them instruments of achieving God's love, if they are willing to give him co-operation in his daily performance of the divine service. Worldly relations as such are only hindrances to devotion; but when engaged in the service of God on account of congeniality of their dispositions, they will be his best helpers. Next stage is that of desolation. It is a state of suffering intense pangs of separation. Now the devotee's pangs of separation are so intense that he cannot breathe even for a moment without God. In this state, there is complete forgetfulness of the world. It is not attachment, but feeling mental disturbance in the experience of God's love in separation. This is the last stage of the devotion. In this stage the devotee renounces the world completely. He has now only one purpose in life, and that is winning God's grace and enjoying his love as a participator in his bliss.

Although it is a difficult path, because the devotee has to keep away from worldly connections, yet by trust in God and through a vow of dedication and self surrender, he may expect to be led on by God. The initiated should aim at the realisation of God by love which is reflected in his daily service of God.

Divine Service (Seva):

Vallabhacharya's religious system is especially distinguished from other religious systems by its introduction of the mode of the Divine service for God-realisation. The Divine Service is different from worship. The worshipper does not feel love for God. It is for the fulfilment of one's desires for personal gains.

It is adoration for self-love and not for God's love, but Seva is for God's love only and not for personal happiness but for God's happiness. It is motivated by love for God alone, and it is the only practical way by which love for God can be expressed. It is to be rendered with body and materials but it is mental in its highest form. Vallabhacharya says in his '*Siddhanta Muktavali*' that mental form of service is the highest[1]. It is defined as interpenetration or interweaving of the mind in God.[2] In worship, there is no interpenetration of mind into God. The man who resorts to worship, offers worship mechanically, taking his clue from the scriptures. The Seva is the outcome of the devotee's love for God and is recommended as a means of establishing soul's contact with God. Worship is a mode of training the devotee's mind and the senses for their engagement in God.

This Service is a practical mode of God-realisation and is inclusive of all the nine kinds of *Sadhana* devotion. Recital of the songs in praise of God and listening to them during service are the *Kirtana* and *Shravan Bhakti*, forms of salutation and falling prostate before the feet of God's image and collecting and preparing necessary things for service are *Vandana*, *Padasevana* and *Archana* Bhakti. The *Dasya*-servitude is indicated by the devotee's actual service to God. The love which impels him to engage in service is his *Sakhya Bhakti* and offering various things such as food, ornaments, flowers, etc. to God during service time is his *Atmanivedana*. Thus a *Pushti* devotee who is engaged in service, has no necessity of practising nine-fold devotion, separately.

Love for God is to be experienced in two ways-in the condition of union with God and in separation from God. The object of love-experience in the *Samyoga* condition is achieved through the mode of service (*Seva*), when the devotee's body and senses are fully engaged in the Divine service. The second kind of love is experienced during the non-service time. It is mental. In *Siddhanta Muktavali*, Vallabhacharya mentions three forms of service—(1) to be rendered by body, (2) by wealth and materials and (3) by mind. Sound health is necessary for the bodily service, wealth for the purpose of the materials like flowers, oranments, clothes, beautiful decorations, perfumes, etc. for presentation to God's image. For mental service, mind alone should express its love, by remembrance of God, for which such things are not needed.

---

[1] Mansisa para mata.

[2] chetah tat pravanam.

There is love in first two but it is not very intense and ardent as in the *Mansi* state.

Thus service is a way of experiencing God's love both physically and mentally. The idea behind it, is to feel oneself at all times in the presence of God.

The Seva is obligatory for all the followers of the *Pushti Marga* in their initial stages so long as they have not renounced the world; but when they renounce the world and are not occupied with worldly affairs, they must rise to the higher plane of *Mansi Seva.*

Vallabhacharya has treated this subject in his work *Seva Phala* where he mentions the three fruits of Seva;

(1) Supernatural strength
(2) Joy of union with God
(3) Body fit for service (Divine Body).

(1) (*Alaukika Samarthya*)*:* rendering service to God a devotee comes to possess supernatural strength. Shri Kalyanrai means by it, strength in singing with Lord, and Shri Gopesha, the strength in acquiring fitness in experiencing divine bliss of love with God. Shri Hariraiji and Purshottamji agree with Gopesha. Lalu Bhatta understands by it, all strength except the power of creation. It is, however, strength by which the soul can enjoy God's love in its varied forms. God comes down to the soul to meet it and recognises as His own.

(2) According to Kalyanrai, *Sayujya* is the state of Union with God, like that of the cowherds of Gokul. Devakinandana, Purushottamji and Lalubhatta, mean by it absorbing oneself into the form of God so that there is complete forgetfulness of the world. It is a state of complete God-consciousness. The devotee has no other thought except of God and about God. Shri Hariraiji explains it, as acquiring strength of experiencing love in union with God. Shri Vallabha (Gokulnatha) understands by it

the enjoyment of the soul's desires with God, which is referred to, as a fruit in the Brahmanand Valli of T. U. He enjoys all desires with God who delights in various sports.

(3) Bodily fitness for service. (*Seva Upayogi Deha*).

For enjoyment of God's love both the body and the soul must be fit. The body is an instrument by which the soul experiences God's love. Soul's fitness is determined by its getting through service, supernatural power, by which God Himself comes to the soul and condescending to give it a place in union with Him as a participator in divine bliss. But, unless the body has been rendered fit, the soul cannot enjoy this bliss. The service makes the body fit for it. It divines its nature. This kind of fitness of the body is essential as a preliminary condition for Seva (service). In the opinion of Purushottamji, it is not an ordinary body but a body turned divine with senses and vital breath in any form; by it, one becomes useful to others who perform higher service. According to Hariraiji, it is a body like that of a bird etc. which brings us close to those who delight in God's bliss. Lakshmana Bhatta, however, believes by this, the body which is not worldly and which qualifies. us for service in (*Vaikuntha*m) heaven or other places. Although there are differences in interpretation of the kind of the body, which is acquired by service, there emerges one fact out of these speculations that as a result of service, the body becomes divine. It is no longer fit for worldly engagements. It is so trasformed that it is useful only for the work of God or for experiencing love of God.

The importance and significance of the service mode, as explained by Vallabhacharya brings home to our mind the fact that the be-all and end-all of a *Pushti* soul, is experiencing love for God through service. A *Pushti* devotee must engage himself in the service of God and will acquire as stated above supernatural strength, by which God will come to him to bless him, and keep him juxtaposition to Him, so that he can enjoy the bliss of God. Not that his soul alone will be fit for God's love, but even his body as an instrument of the soul will be made fit.

Vallabhacharya does not merely mention the fruits of service but also points out the dangers to it. These dangers result from three sources (1) Mental anguish, (2) Obstacles and (3) Enjoyments or pleasures. These are avoidable by the devotee's effort and unavoidable due to God's will. The mind must be free from mental anguish in order to get it engaged in God. Mental destraction is the greatest obstacle to the seeker of God. In his work *Navaratna* Vallabhacharya admonishes that the *Pushti* devotee must be above fears and anxieties, since he has taken a vow of submission and consecration to God. To entertain cares or feeling remorse means to destrust God. He should have full trust in God that He is his best well-wisher, and will always do the right thing for him. This trust must be absolute and must not be allowed to be shaken at all. The miseries should not be regarded as curses but as God's blessings, not only as regards worldly matters but even in the matter of divine experience. This is to be strictly followed in all the circumstances. Any kind of grief is the opposite of love, so, in a mind overpowered by grief the love for God cannot arise. So grief must be avoided, but if it is due to God's will, or the grief felt as a result of God's separation it cannot be avoided.

Similarly, if he apprehends obstacles from worldly relatives and friends, efforts should be made to avoid them, but if they are due to God's will, no efiorts should be made to avoid them. In that case, one must submit to the will of God. If there are frequent interruptions, due to obstacles beyond one's power, one must think that the soul is not as yet deemed fit for God's grace. He must betake to spiritual means and wait till his nature is so transformed that it becomes divine. Instead of engaging oneself in service, one must seek knowledge of God in that case.

The pleasures or enjoyments also interrupt our love or service to God. They have, therefore, to be avoided. If the pleasures are of a worldly nature, a devotee must keep himself away from them, believing that they are transient, and destructive. If the enjoyments are on account of God's will, no efforts should be made to avoid them.

Paraticipation of the Divine Bliss or enjoyment of God's love is the highest-fruit of the Divine service. This is called *Rasalila* which is described in the Xth book of the *Bhagavata Purana* and also in the *Vishnu Purana* and in the *Harivamsha Purana.* The writers of these works and even of Gitagovinda, know Krishna as God only. These works are considered sacred by the Hindus. The love of the Gopis for Krishna according to them, is symbolical of the devotee's love for God. The same love is described in the songs by the poets like Surdasa, Kumbhandasa, and others. Witnessing or enjoying the sport of God's Dance with His favourite souls, is the bliss of *Rasalila* which has been taught as the goal of the *Pushti* soul.

Krishna Chaitanya, a great preacher, and contemporary of Vallabhacharya, lived an ascetic's life and was most eloquent about the ideal of the Gopi-love. According to him, it is not to be enjoyed by the worldly senses, mind and body but by their being transfigured as divine. The only condition for the fitness of enjoyment of this divine love is that the soul must achieve affinity with God and make the body, senses and mind divine. Vallabhacharya's doctrine of *Brahma Sambhandha* is a preliminary step for making them divine. It must be followed by service, which will detach the soul from the world and attach it to God by gradual development of love through *Sneha-Asakati* and *Vyasana.* The soul that reaches the last condition of love is blessed by God for His Grace.

The fruit of devotion or service of God in the *Pushti Marga* is not liberation, but union with God and participation in His bliss.

The word '*Bhakti*' bears implication of the sense of service according to the etymology of the word. The word '*Bhakti*' is derived from the root '*Bhaj*' which means 'to serve.' To this root the termination '*ti*' is added, which connotes the sense of love. So, the whole word means love with service, or love for God to be expressed through service. The word *Bhakti* theoretically means love and practically means service, which is divine worship. Really speaking it is imperfect in conveying exactly the sense underlying service.

As stated above, service is obligatory for every one who is initiated in the *Pushti Marga.* It is a practical way of translating into action, the vow of consecration, taken at the time of *Brahma Sambandha* ceremony. Lord Krishna of Gokul whose *Lilas* are described in the Xth Book of the Bhagavata is the supreme in Vallabha's system. Service is rendered to Krishna only, by the followers of *Pushti Marga.* God is served as a child or a lover, according to one's means and circumstances. Love is the first thing. Whatever is offered to God by love becomes acceptable to Him. Even the best of things, offered to God without love, are not accepted by God, for, as said above , it is nothing but a mode of expressing love of God by the way of dedication. The rich or the poor, men or women, the high or the low class persons, all are qualified for service, provided-they feel love for God. Service in private families is only for the members of the family. In *Havelies* or *Mandirs*-shrines service is rendered by the descendants of Vallabhacharya wherein every follower of the *Pushti Marga* offers his prayer and renders varied service and has the sight of God.

The service to Lord Krishna is eightfold, according to the daily life of Shri Krishna, from the morning to the close of the day. At each time, the devotees are very anxious to have *Darsana* (Sight) of God's Image, which takes place in order of the service time. It commences first with *Mangala,* the time of waking Krishna in the morning. Next is that of *Srinagara* when the image is decked with dress and ornaments. It is followed by *Gwala,* when the service is offered to Krishna as a cowheard. This is followed by *Rajabhoga* at noon, which marks the lunch hour of Krishna in the forest with his boy companions. After this Krishna is supposed to enjoy a nap in the forest and awake. This is called *Utthapana.* It is followed by *Bhoga,* taking food by Krishna. At evening time, Krishna returns to Gokul, with his cows. This is also marked by service called *Sandhya.* Last *Darsana* is at night, when Krishna retires to bed for sleep. Thus, eight times from the daily life of Krishna are chosen for service. The ideal of Supreme God in this system is God as Love or joy in His Beautiful form. God is no doubt, Truth (*Satyam*) and Knowledge (*Jnana*) or goodness, but He is, besides these, and above these, Beauty. So the service is rendered in a beautiful way. Its form of service varies not only each day at different times, but varies from day to day and season to season. The best food, the best dresses and jewellery, are different on different occasions, with the best of garlands and music are characteristic features of this service mode. Every detail of service is carefully and aesthetically selected with the consciousness that it is to be expressive of love for God, who is Perfect Beauty. In this mode of service the singing of the kirtan before the image of the Lord is its special feature. It varies according to the *Darshana*, in accordance with the hour of the day. The music in the morning is not the same as in the noon and then in the evening. It is different in different melody.

The divine service in Vallabhacharya's faith is rendered to the idols of God. One will raise a question : How can an idol represent God? It is a piece of stone, wood or some metal. True, that it is an idol, made of a stone etc.; yet it can repersent the form of God. There are two explanations for this. One is that if philosophically All is God, and an idol being a part of All, does represent God, otherwise God's omnipresence will have to be denied. Another explanation, furnished by Purushottamji, is on the analogy of fire, penetrating the iron ball. To Vallabhacharya, an idol of God is not an idol, but the very *Swarupa*—form of God who is love and joy.

In Vallabhacharya's system, Krishna is the highest form of God. He is Brahman, all enveloping and all compenetrating Reality, which is analysed into all its attributes and powers. As such, He is personal God. He is *Akshara* and transcends it. Although a manifestor of Being and Consciousness, in which His 'Bliss' is hidden, He is above them—pure Bliss in form. This God in Bliss-form is the absolute value. The Bliss aspect in God, is latent in His being and consciousness aspects. He is described as *Rasa* (Love) also. This *Rasa* of God is communicated to the devotees by His grace. Though God Krishna as God is absolute joy, He is realised in this concrete form. Although, He appears in the world for setting its disturbed order aright, He has no human form. His body is divine and bereft of materiality. It is on account of God's divine power called *Maya*, that human beings consider Him as having a human body.

Divine Grace :

Vallabhacharya's path of devotion is called *Pushti Marga* or the path of divine grace. God-realisation is the aim of every devotional soul; but it is not achieved by the efforts or means of the devotee, but, by God's Grace. The final goal is dependent upon God's will, which is a synonymn of God's Grace. This idea of God's grace is important in Christianity. The *Kathopanishada*[1] says that a man can have the vision of God, by God's Grace. The same idea is expressed again[2] where it is identified with the choice of God. The Bhagavata emphasises that God's revelation to the devotee is due to God's grace. The Gita describes it on three levels-first, on the lower plane through *Buddhi Yoga*—the communion through intellect,[3] then in a higher state, when God is moved by compassion[4] and in the final stage, when God of His own will bestows grace on the devotee. Vallabhacharya, no doubt, recognises devotion as a means of God-realisation, but says that without God's grace, it is not possible. According to him, God's grace is all in-all. It is bestowed only on those, who have surrendered themselves to God and loved Him, and they are pure, faultless and exempt from application of the Law of *Karma*. Without God's grace, *Karma* will not achieve anything. All their activity is attributed to God's grace. Unless they are free from sex-love and anger; God will not mark them for His Grace. Service of God is the preliminary step in the direction of God's grace. It is when God enters the heart of the devotee and takes its possession, so that the devotee's love is given to Him alone, that we can say that he is chosen by God for His Grace.

Although-grace is supreme in influencing the devotees' activities, they are not to shirk their duties and responsibilities of life. They have to be performed and discharged without any attachment to fruits but only with the consideration that it is God's wish, that they should be performed, so long as they are in the worldly stage. Even devotion as a means of God-realisation, is to be practised, not for liberation, but for winning God's love, believing that the reward of devotion is nothing else but God's love in the form of His Grace. The doctrine of Grace, is the very breath or life of the *Pushti Marga.* It is the most distinguishable feature of Vallabhacharya's faith. It is by God's grace that men live and move about, make sacrifices for others and live religious life and enjoy God's Bliss.

---

[1] 1-2-20. K.U. [2] 1-2-22. K.U. [3] B.G. X-10. [4] B.G.X-11

Nirodha-A special kind of mind discipline.

It is a discipline of non-attachment to worldly objects and at the same time, of attachment to God.

Just as the mode of service to God is a special feature of the *Pushti Marga,* so is Nirodha, a mode of concentration of mind on God. Control of mind is considered necessary for spiritual life in all religious systems. Patanjali, the author of *Yoga Sutras,* has not only advocated it, but has mentioned the method of *Ashtanga Yoga* as a proper method for controlling the mind. He defines *Yoga* as control over predilections or tendencies of the mind. The Gita accepts the ideal of *Yoga,* not in the sense of Patanjali, but in the sense of 'union with God.' Each chapter of the Gita is entitled as a particular kind of *Yoga,* which is intended as a mode of soul's union with God. Work, knowledge, mind-control, devotion, self-surrender are the various ways recommended for the attainment of *Yoga.* Devotion is but the best way for that. The aim of Patanjali's *Yoga* is the control of the mind and curbing its predelections. This is known by him as *Nirodha* (Mental Discipline). Vallabhacharya does not believe in the method of supression of the mind by coercion or force. That is a negative way. It fails to achieve its desired object. Very often it has adverse repercussion. The desires may be compared with Hydra's heads, which will not be destroyed, even if they are cut but on the contrary will grow again mainfold. The new psychologists, who call themselves Freudians are also inclined to this view. From innumerable cases studied by them, they have come to the conclusion that by killing desires, they are not killed. They will rise again from their ashes like the Phoenix bird. From a close study of human mind, Vallabhacharya arrives at the same truth that the desires cannot be killed and even if they are killed, it will not help much in spiritual advance. One does not know when they will rise again and assail the devotee. Again the suppression-method is useless for a householder, so Vallabhacharya, has advocated his theory of *Nirodha,* which teaches how to sublimate desires without suppressing them, so that, instead of being deterrents, they will be guided to the goal of union with God after prolonged reflection. This is a new technique of mind discipline, a unique one in the religious systems, of not only of India, but all over the world. It does not ask one to give up the world, but teaches to live in the world and carry on work as a God's man, under God's command. What ever desires you have, regard them as God's desires and satisfy them, by the love of God. Make God an object of your desires. If your aim is material happiness of the world, consider God as your material happiness. If love is your desire, then seek God's love. If you are fond of music, sing songs of God's glory or God's *lilas*. If you are fond of dainty dishes, prepare them for God. If you are fond of art, love pictures about God's *lilas*. If you desire wealth, earn it by honest means and use it in the service of God. Directing desires unto God is a great help in the devotional life. Change their focus only and the same desires, instead of being hostile will be friendly to you. *Nirodha* is, no doubt, a mode of mental discipline, by which the mind is restrained from worldly objects and turned to God. It cuts the ice both ways. It prevents the mind from being attached to worldly objects and directs it towards God. It is a simultaneous process like tide and ebb in the sea. If there is tide in one direction there is the ebb in the opposite. *Nirodha* determines the height reached by the soul on a devotional plane, by leaving the world plane. In other words, *Nirodha* is a mode of transcendence of one's self and the world, and of reaching God. It is simultaneous process of detachment from the world and attachment to God. It has also several stages like those of devotion, in which the last stage is identical with *Vyasana* designated as the condition of experiencing God, not only in all the forms of cosmic existences but in all physical, mental and spiritual functions (*Sarvatma-bhava*) of the embodied soul of the devotee. It is supreme love which makes the *Pushti soul* thoroughly God-conscious. It believes that it has nothing to do with the world and that in this world he must live God's love for only. To the *Pushti* soul, life as such has no interest for it, except for God's love.

Vallabhacharya describes *Nirodha*, under two aspects. The *Swarupa* (natural form) aspect is explained in his '*Subodhini*' commentary on the Bhagavata and the *Karya* (effect) aspect in his independent work entitled '*Nirodha Lakshana* (Characteristics of Mind-Control)

Let us try to understand the *Swarupa* or nature of Nirodha, according to Vallabhacharya.

Etymologically, it is derived from the root '*rudh*' to confine or restrain, with a prefix '*ni*' meaning 'excessively.' This means that it is an act of restraining the mind thoroughly. The mind has to be restrained from the world, for the attainment of God.

The Bhagavata is a work devoted to the *Lilas* of Lord Krishna. The topic of the 10th book is *Nirodha*,[1] and refers to *Nirodha* and gives explanations about its meaning:—

(1) It is the dwelling of God in the world with all His powers. This means that God, who is transcendental comes down to the world and makes His abode there and enjoys His divine play.

(2) In the sense of destruction, it means a process of restraining mind from the world for the sake of God. There is another explanation, which means that it is a process by which God is restrained or confined in the heart of the devotee i.e. it is the mode, by which God Himself enters the devotee's heart and abides in it, for him. *Nirodha* is a mental state of remembering God under all conditions. Mind and senses of a devotee are engaged in God, and feeling themselves in the presence of God mentally, either in separation from or union with God. In separation he feels pangs of separation, like Yashoda, *Nanda* and cowherd girls of *Gokula* who became unhappy in the absence of Krishna. In the happy state of union, his mind enjoys like that of the Gopis, meeting Krishna. On festive occasions, his mind is excessively enraptured. Thus in conditions of agony, happiness or great occasions of joy, he must remember, and experience His love. In one form or another he

---

[1] Bhg.S. 2-10-6 Karikas 9-10 in the beginning of the 10th canto, 10-11-48, 2-10-1, 10-25-3.

should remember God by singing and reciting God's glorious deeds or *Lilas*, which is the only way of winning God's grace. God is merciful, and if one remembers Him by singing His glories, He will bestow His Grace on him, which is not to be obtained by one's own effort except by His own Will. Instead of the devotee seeking Him, God will seek the devotee, if his love is selfless and supreme. Even a man of knowledge cannot attain Him, without His grace. The devotee should, therefore, not cease from singing God's glory until merciful God showers His blessings on him. A devotee feels joy in singing God's glory, but the joy from God's grace is of the superior kind. This grace comes only, when God sees the devotee experiencing unbearable agony, on account of separation from Him. God, seated in the heart of a devotee, manifests Himself before the devotee, when he remembers God and extols joy. Hence the fruit of *Nirodha* is obtained, when God reveals Himself to the devotee. To achieve it, the preliminary condition is that the mind and the senses must be withdrawn from worldly objects and directed to God. So the first thing to do is to engage the mind and senses in the service of God. So long as the body and the senses are engaged in worldly matters, God's presence in the body, can not be felt by the devotee as they are unholy. Pursuits of worldly activities tend to make it impure, so for the sanctification of the body and the senses, they must be withdrawn from worldly matters and entirely employed in the service of God. The eyes should be engaged in drinking the beauty of God's face, the ears in listening to God's praises, the nose in smelling the perfume of flowers presented to Him, the hands and feet in preparing things required for His service and making movements like fetching water etc. Every sense has its use in the service of God. Even the excretionary and generative organs have their usefulness, the former keeping the body pure and the latter by begetting a son who will assist his parents in the service to God. The way of sublimation of the senses is according to Vallabhacharya, transferring them in the service of God. By this discipline, the senses, which were like impure gold, will be pure and lustrous like pure gold. *Nirodha* is thus a process of sanctification and divinisation of the soul along with its body, mind and senses. It is only when the soul is freed from worldly influences, it becomes fit for the grace by divine nature. Originally, prior to the soul's entering the world, it was divine, but it lost its divinity, during worldly career. *Nirodha* indicates the way for freedom from worldliness and getting back its divinity. The best example of those souls who secured God's Grace, through *Nirodha* is that of the *Gopis* of *Gokula.* They were in the world, and yet they were not worldly, as their hearts and minds were in constant communion with God.

SANYASA (Renunciation):

The question of renunciation is considered by Vallabhacharya in his work *Sanyasa Nirnaya*—(Determination of Renunciation). Generally, it is identified with an ascetic's life. A *Sanyasi* is a man who has given up all connections with the world, even with the members of his family. He wears a particular kind of dress as a mark of his asceticism and lives in a secluded place, all alone, for spirituality. He turns away from every kind of work. The Hindu scriptures divide a man's life into four phases (1) as a celebate (2) as a house holder (3) as a forest dweller and (4) as a recluse. In the first stage, he gathers knowledge useful for the discharge of his duties in life. As a householder he has to shoulder certain responsibilities for his family and the society. He has to engage himself in some kind of useful work, for livelihood and performing social duties. When he reaches an age of fifty or so, he becomes free from worldly responsibilities and prefers living in a forest, away from his people, transferring the worldly burden to his children. After this, when he learns that his soul cannot find real happiness by living in the world, or from enjoyment of worldly pleasures, he becomes sick of the world and leaves it and lives in a secluded place as an ascetic, spending his time in getting the knowledge of *Brahman* to achieve liberation. This last phase of life is known as *Sanyasa.* It is no doubt recommended to the seekers of spiritual life; but it is subject to some conditions. It is to be entered upon, after passing through the first three stages. This is an ordinary rule, but there is an exception allowed in the case of those who are highly advanced in knowledge and spirituality. They are permitted to accept an ascetic's life at any time when they feel an urgent need from within, due to their conviction of the illusive character of the world, and in consequence disgust for the world. The Gita has deprecated ascetic life, because it apprehends that if the ascetic life became the order of the day and if people accepted it without preserving the order, it will lead to the break up of social life affecting marriage and progeny. In XVIII-2, the Gita deprecates the *Sanyasa* and appreiates *Tyaga*. *Sanyasa* means renouncing all duties promoted by desires; but *Tyaga* means renouncing the fruits of all actions. He would carry on his duties, and yet can be a *Tyagi* by non-attachment to the fruits of actions. He should give up not his work but his desires for fruits. Thus a householder can be a real *Tyagi*. Vallabhbharya, no doubt, recognises it for experiencing agony caused by separation from God; but in his opinion renunciation of an ascetic is good for nothing. Its aim is simply to advance in spirituality and attain liberation. This aim is not fulfilled in the present age because it is unfavourable for the ascetic's life. Its goal is liberation but there is no participation with God in His Bliss. Very often, it so happens that persons renouncing the world have to regret for want of sufficient strength of mind in resisting temptations and difficulties. So renunciation of an ascetic is good for nothing, either in the initial stage or in an advanced stage. In the initial stage also, purification of mind is necessary. For this, the daily sacrifices have to be performed. This is opposed to the spirit of the ascetic's life. Even in the higher state of knowledge, the goal is reached after many births. If renunciation has any value, it is only in the path of devotion. Here also it cannot be successful in the Nine-fold type of Devotion; because not worth seeking for God-realisation. The devotees have to come in contact with others and the devotees should have necessary means for the practice of devotional acts. If a renouncer of the world comes in contact with other persons even for devotional acts, there is a danger of interruptions from the outsiders in his concentration of the mind on God. Again, in order to collect necessary means, he must associate with worldly people. This will interrupt his concentration of mind on God. So the only favourable way in renunciation is that of love-devotion. For experiencing pangs of separation from God, no company is required and no means are needed. Since God is the protector, no hindrances are apprehended. According to

Vallabhacharya, the real value of renuncation lies in experiencing love-pangs of separation from God. This means, when love reaches the stage of *Vyasana*, the worldly connections should be completely cut off by him, and remaining all alone, he should engage one's mind in contemplation of God and feeling agony of separation from God. The devotee in *Vyasana* state is so deeply absorbed in God's love, that neither knowledge, nor attributes of God can detract him from it. Being pleased by the devotee's love, God reveals Himself to him. Such renunciation is very hard to attain. It is realised by love and in no other way. Vallabhacharya concludes that the renunciation by the path of love (*Bhakti*) is the only proper one. Any other path will lead to down fall and degradation of the soul.

Sarvatambhava (Experiencing God with supreme love that transcends all worldly loves including self-love)

This is also in Vallabha's system, a way of emotional integration of the soul with God. It means feeling all self-love for God. It is the mark indicating soul's fitness for the grace of God. The B.U.[1] says that all earthly kinds of love are only the forms of self-love. One loves one's self and therefore seeks its happiness from earthly loves. His love for wealth, fame, power, social work, wife and also children is really seeking love for its self. This is a cause of its worldly bondage, but by transferring that to God the soul is freed from worldly bondage and is restored to God. C.U.[2] requires that the self should love God's sport (*Krida*) with Him and also enjoy love dalliance with Him. The self-love should merge into love for God. This condition of *Sarvatambhava* is the process transferring one's own love to God. Before its achievement, the soul sought various kinds of earthly love, because it loves itself, but during experience of *Sarvatamabhava* it does not think of earthly love in reference to its own self; but does so with reference to God. Just as in the presence of the sun, the mist disappears, so in the presence of *Sarvastambhava*, self-love does not exist. The self-love now is transformed into the love for God. For God-realisation, it is the only stage. The author of the Brahmasutras also recognises its worth as of the highest value.[3] It is asserted that it cannot be achieved by one's own efforts but by grace of God. It is described as the highest means as it is dependent upon God's grace.[1] Its supremacy is also declared in the Shvetaketu episode of the C.U.[2] It is a cause of the forgetfulness of the world and gaining uncommon power by which the soul is qualified for the union with God.[3] It cannot be obstructed or destroyed by time or any factor.[4] It makes the devotee disregard liberation and seek God's grace in the form of His revealation.[5] Even death cannot deter the devotee from seeking God's love by *Sarvatambhava*.[6] Lalubhatta explains it in his 'P.R.' by the statement that the love of self should be converted into God's love; the self should regard its love, not for its enjoyment but for God's enjoyment. The *Atmabhava* (Self-love) should so develop that it will get transformed into Bhagavadbhava (The divine love). All kinds of love seeking of the self must be for God and not for its own sake, since the devotee should know that as he has taken a vow of consecration and dedication, he has consecrated all his worldly love to God. As he belongs to God all, his belongings also have become God's, just as his individual love for worldly things, get absorbed in God's love. So Sarvatmbhava is the state of absorption of the self-love into God's love. This is not like the absorption of the soul in Brahman, which is the goal of knowledge. It differs from it in the fact that the absorption of *gnani* is the absorption of the soul, where as the absorption of a devotee is the absorption of his love only. It retains its separate entity, for participation in the bliss of God. In absorption, the soul has no separate entity. Sometimes, during the experience of *Sarvatmabhava*, the devotee identifies himself with Krishna, just as some Gopis acted the role of Krishna, while seeking Him in the forest. But this identification of the devotee with God is not *Tadatmya*. It is only a state of passing emotion in love experience. The Sarvatmabhava is of two kinds-of *Pushsti Maryada* and of pure *Pushti*. The latter being love experience of God, passes under the head of *Sringara Rasa* in the terminology of the aesthetics.

---

[1] IV, 5 [2] 7.25-2. [3] B.S. 3-3-43.

Gopeshvara, explaining the nature of *Sarvatmabhava* in his work *Bhakti Martanda*, characterises it as the highest form of

---

[1] B.S. 3-3-44. [2] B.S. 3-3-45/47 [3] B.S. 3-3-48. [4] B.S. 3-3-49.
[5] B.S. 3-3-50. [6] B.S. 3-3-51.

Bhakti. It is so called, because it is the love for God, experienced by all the senses and mind. By *Sarva* he understands 'all senses', by *Atman* 'mind' and by *Bhava* 'love for God'. Commenting on it, he remarks that *Sarvatamabhava* is possible after renunciation of the world and that it is to be expressed only through love, which reminds the soul of its relation to God. It is preceded by complete abandonment of sensuality and is enjoyed mentally by love expressions like kissing, embracing God etc. The condition of *Sarvatmahava* mentioned above, is the outcome of its *Vyasana* condition-the last stage of love for God. It is flowering of *Vyasana* and an acme of *Nirodha.* It is the state in which, the self and world are both transcended. The self forgets its relation to the world and re-establishes it with God. It now seeks its satisfaction of love from God. This is the final stage in the development of the self's love for God. Culmination of devotional love wherein God reveals His Form to it, gives it the bliss of His love. This idea of Sarvatmabhava is as old as the B.U., where *Yagnavalkya* says to his wife "worldly relations such as sons etc are not dear for their sake and but for the sake of God". This idea is also emphasised by the author of the B.S.[1] It is said to be the gift of God.[2] It cannot be achieved by one's own efforts.[3] and that the Sarvatmabhava is an indication of God's grace and is more potent than any other means in God-realisation. It[4] is said that the forgetfulness of the world and getting power of attainment of God are preliminary features of this stage. The fruit of Sarvatmabhava-enjoyment of God's love-is indicated in 3-3-50. It is incomparable with any other means including knowedge. The word Sarvatmabhava is capable of yielding different interpretations, depending upon the meanings of *Sarva,* (All) *Atman,* (soul) and (love) *Bhava,* the component words occuring in it. 'All' may be understood, as God or Universe, '*Atman*' as (1) self, or (2) God, and '*Bhava*' as (1) love or (2) presence or (3) condition. Taking all these different versions together, we may give the following interpretations of this compound word (1) All (full) self love to God (2) All love for God (Atman i.e. God) i.e. complete love for God. (3) Self love to all (4) Love for God to all (5) All love of God to the soul (6) Experience of God's presence in all (Realising complete God-like state) (7) Experiencing God in all. All these meanings may be reduced to (1) Self love, (2) Universal love and (3) Love for God and (4) God's love for the soul. Vallabhacharya understands that in the primary stage of the Sarvatmabhavā in the sense of the self-love for God which in higher stage acquires the condition, in which God will come down to the soul and love it, for, God now recognises the soul as His own. Once it was His own; but after separation, in the intermediate stages, it forgot its relation, but now remembering that relation, seeks union with God, who knowing its intensity and ardour of love, is moved by love to come to the soul and restore it, its original status and fulfil its aspiration. Soul's love, which was primarily self-love, develops into universal love, seeing God in all phenomena, and transcending them progresses further to stay in the proximity with God. So what was once self-love is now completely transformed into Divine love.

---

[1] B.S. 3-3-43 to 57. [2] B.S. 3-3-43. [3] B.S. 3-3-44. [4] Bhg. S. 10-29-24 & B.S. 3-3-48.

The self-love is a seed, the universal love a tree with branches and leaves, love for God a flower and God's love for the soul a fruit. As stated above, it is not only self-transcending but also world transcending. It is not identification with or merging into God. Nor is it a passive state of union of the soul with God. It is the state of active participation and enjoyment of God's love by the soul. Sometimes during this experience, the soul may have the feeling of identification with God, as expressed in 'I am Krishna'; but this is not non-dualism, it is only an emotional state, a sort of passing phase of experience of love. It is not the condition due to knowledge. It is not only knowing God as Love, but feeling and realising Him as God. This Sarvatmabhava by which God Himself enjoys love with the soul, and makes Himself the object of enjoyment by the soul is illustrated in the Bhagavata by the Gopi-love. It is an ideal, only of a devotee though all the devotees cannot hope to get it. It is the gift of God to be attained by His Grace alone.

Surrender:

The idea of surrender is common almost in all the religions, which believe in the existence of God. It is one way of establishing the soul's relation with God which may be either that of a servant to his master, or of a friend to a friend, or of one lover to another. Whatever may be the kind of the relation, the soul surrendering to God has absolute trust in Him, and regards Him as its protector. When it is motivated by the fulfilment of one's desire, such as health, wealth or power, it is expressed in the form of a selfish prayer. The higher form of prayer is offered to invoke God's succour in times of national disasters such as war, famine, spread of epidemics, or natural calamities like earth-quakes etc. Sometimes this idea of surrender is expressed only through the chanting of the Hymns of Eulogy, extalling God's glory, in which no boon is desired from Him. These prayers are for self-purification, but they are very effective in spiritualising a God-Seeker's life. The *Rigveda* is full of such prayers. Although they are addressed to various deities such as *Indra, Agni, Varuna, Vayu* etc. they are in fact addressed to God, whose powers are represented in each deity individually. The significance of these prayers is to make a man surrender himself to God in all his affairs of life. There are other ways of expressing surrender, such as offering sacrifices, practising penance, worshipping God and betaking to concentration of mind on God. Vallabhacharya's way is the devotional way of consecration to God by service and love, and by daily remembering that God is his protector.

The main teaching of the Gita centers round surrender. Krishna exhorting Arjuna says, 'Surrender to me alone, Oh Arjuna, disregarding all other means. There is no fear of sin in surrender. If you surrender yourself to me, you will have immunity from every sin.'[1] The same teaching of the Gita is emphasised by the Bhagavata. The last chapter of the Gita closes with the teaching of surrender and the last book of the Bhagavata also lays a stress upon the necessity of surrender on the part of the devotee. Both these scriptures advocate surrender as the only way for getting God's grace. But only those persons will be moved mentally to surrender themselves to God, who are free from pride and egoism, and who know their limitations as men, and are aware that without God's guidance and protection, nothing can be achieved by them, even though they have reached the highest status in this world in their own fields. He must know that a man by himself is so weak that he cannot move even a little stone despite his boast of his gigantic physical strength. He must be fully conscious that behind all phenomena, there is some supreme power, which alone rules, not only human destiny; but even natural phenomena and that a man despite all his power, learning and strength is too weak to protect himself against the evil days. It is his faith in God as a protector, by surrender to God, that he can get through successfully during the evil days. Vallabhacharya, however, warns us against making such a use of surrender-a means for seeking God's protection in our evil days or for satisfying our worldly desires. It is appreciated for getting God's love and grace.

---

[1] B.G. XVIII-66.

There are two kinds of surrender, one for liberation which is taught by Krishna to Arjuna in the Gita and the second for getting God's love which is taught in the Bhagavata. The second kind of the surrender, according to Hariraiji is of two kinds, (1) The *Siddha Sharana* (Absolute surrender) and (2) The *Sadhana Sharana* (Surrender as a means). The second kind is accomplished by some means such as *Viveka* (discrimination), *Dhairya* (fortitude) and *Asrya* (Resort to God). By first the devotee will know that everything is ordained by God according to His will. A man has no free will. All things and happenings are pre-determined by God. By second, he is to bear all kinds of ills and sufferings, and by the third, he will put himself absolutely under the protection of God. Here, Surrender is accompanied by these three virtues. This sort of surrender is no doubt inferior but it is helpful in leading the soul nearer to God. The devotee does carry on all his duties and responsibilities with trust in God alone and bears all sorts of sufferings-physical as well as mental. He does not renounce the world, but believing that he is God's servant, he lives his life so as to be worthy of God's grace. The other kind of surrender known as Absolute surrender does not depend upon any means. It requires complete renunciation of all the means for experiencing God's love in the state of separation from God. Neither knowledge of God, nor singing his glorious deeds will come in the way of the devotee's experience of God's love. This is ideal self-surrender, according to Vallabhacharya. Only rare souls by God's grace can rise to it. In this sense, Vallabhacharya's teaching of surrender differs from that of other Hindu Acharyas. Vitthalanathji has rightly appreciated it by giving him an epithet of the special kind of Surrender.

Concept of Krishna as Divinity:

Philosophical Significance:

It is necessary to give here a brief sketch of the life of Krishna who figures as Supreme God, in Vallabhacharya's religion. To Vallabhacharya, He is symbolical of the *Rasa* or *Ananda* [Bliss] form of God though the Bhagavata has treated Him historically. No doubt the method of treatment is historical but the meaning behind it is symbolical. According to the Bhagavata, historically Krishna belonged to the Yadava tribe. His father's name was Vasudeva and mother's Devaki, the sister of Kamsa, the King of Mathura. His birth took place at midnight on the 8th day of Shravana in the prison, where his parents were locked up by Kamsa who was foretold that he would meet death at the hands of the eighth child of his sister. Krishna was her eighth child. For the safety of this child, Vasudeva immediately removed him from that place and took him to Gokul and exchanged him with the newly born daughter of Yashoda, the wife of Nanda. Krishna grew there with his foster brother Balaram, as the son of Yashoda and Nanda. Krishna's early life was spent at Gokula, then for some time at Mathura, and subsequently for the greater part at Dwarka.

Some remarkable incidents of his life at Gokula and Brindavan are the delievrance of his fellow villagers from demonical beings like *Putana*, *Trinavarta*, *Vatsasura*, *Aghasura*, the serpent *Kaliya*, *Bakasura*, *Dhenukasura* and several others. He was very dear to the village cows and for this, he earned the name of Gopal. Once he saved the people of Vraja from the forest fire. His music on the flute was exceedingly melodious. He humbled the pride of Indra and lifted the Govardhan Hill on a single finger of the right hand. He performed the *Rasa* dance with the cowherdesses of Gokula. He and his brother Baldeva accompanied Akrura to Mathura, and killed Kamsa, the greatest enemy of the people. Subsequently Krishna and his brother entered the *Gurukula* of the sage *Sandipani* and stayed there till the completion of their education.

He stays at Mathura for some time. During this period, he had to fight with the kings namely Jarasandha, Shishupala and some other. He took active part in the great war between the Pandavas and the Kauravas, taking the side of the Pandavas. The XIth book of the Bhagavata describes how He left this earth hurt by an arrow from a hunter.

The name of Krishna is as old as the Vedas. The word Krishna occurs, apart from the Mahabharata, in Rigveda VIII-85-3-4 and the Chhandogya Upanishad III-17-6. In the Veda he is represented as Vedic seer; and in the Upanishad as a pupil of Ghora Angirasa and as a son of Devaki. Panini refers to Krishna and Arjuna as objects of worship. Patanjali identifies Krishna with Vasudeva, as a Divinity. The Puranas regard Krishna not only as a form of Vishnu, the all pervasive God, but also as the prefect form of God. Although some Western scholars like Lorinest, Webber and Lassen have tried to prove that the Krishna cult is derived from the influence of Christianity, in fact it is anterior to Christianity. It has been an established fact that the concept of Krishna is an orginal concept of God as old as the Vedas.

According to the Hindu Mythology, Krishna is a synonymn of Brahman, the Supreme Reality mentioned in the Upanishads. He is the non-dual, self luminous, changless spirit. He is both the material and efficient cause of the universe. He is omnipotent, omnipresent, and omniscient. The word 'Krishna' signifies three aspects of Krishna, which are Existence, consciousness, *Ananda* or Bliss. He is thus *Sach-Chid-Ananda.* With being and consciousness plus limited joy, he is known as *Akshara.* In pure form of Love, Beauty and Bliss he is known as Krsihna. In the Upanishadas he is known as *Rasa* or Love. All the attributes that the Upanishadas ascribe to *Brahman* belong to Krishna. In his all pervasive character he is known as *Brahman.* As he possesses six glorious attributes-greatness, potency, glory, beauty, knowledge and detachment from the worldly objects-he is known as Bhagavan. As an originator of the world, he is called *Akshara.* He is thus known by various names; yet, he is not a human being, but Supreme God. According to the Upanishads, God, before His manifestation in the forms of the world and multiplicity of the souls, was all alone in his absolute form. He wished to be many and then he assumed many forms for his own sport or joy. He enjoys it in various ways and on various planes. God's various ways of self-enjoyment through his *Lilas* are described in the Bhagavata. In short Krishna's *Lilas* in the Bhagavata are the lilas of God-the perfect Divinity.

The subject of the Xth book of the Bhagavata is *Nirodha.* In the *Yoga* system, it conveys the sense of self control. Here it is not to be understood in that sense. The Bhagavata, being a work which emphasises devotion as means of God-realisation by the withdrawal of the senses from worldly objects and focussing them on God, ordains that one must detach one's mind from the world and engage it in God. Both these senses are implied in the world *Nirodha.* It is not a negative but a positive way of God-realisation. In *Nirodha,* the soul does not remain passive. It participates in the experience of Joy with God. The Lilas of Krishna are the different ways according to temperamental differences of the souls for enabling them for their participation in the experience of Joy with God. The devotee of God has to fight with internal enemies such as ignorance, avarice, lust, hypocrisy etc. as well as external enemies who are symbolised as the *Asuras.* Krishna's fighting with and killing demons in Gokula is suggestive of removal of the evils that hinder progress in spiritual life. The *Lilas* of Krishna or the Absolute are of three kinds and on three planes: (1) Cosmic *Lila* as manifested in the outer world in the multiplicity of objects, (2) Supra Cosmic *Lila* comprehended as the unity among the multiplicity and (3) through his incarnations. The Lilas of Krishna, are performances of the perfect incarnation of God. It is here worthwhile to quote a passage from F.P. Johanns's book on Vallabha.

"But Krishna is not only *Ananda.* His Joy is self communicative. To the *Bhakta* souls His joy is communicated and they feel the *Rasa*-thrill, that accompanies all joyful experience. *Rasa* is primary in God and secondary or derived in the devotee (*Bhaktas*). The devoted souls have got a body of joy, their being is joy, and their soul or self itself is joy experience accompanied by *Rasa*-thrill."

Nirodha means experiencing of *Rasa* or thrill or Joy in union with God. It has been given expression to in poetry by *Vyasa* in the Bhagavata, Jayadeva in his Git-Govind, and poets namely Surdasa, Nanda, Kumbhandasa, Parmanandadas in Hindi, and others and Narasimha, Mira and Dayaram in Gujarati. These *Lilas* have been illustrated in the various pictures by the artists. Each *Lila* of Krishna, according to Vallabhacharya, has a philosophical significance.

The Bhagavata says that Krishna is a child of Vasudeva and Devki. Philosophically Vasudeva is the highest degree of *Sattva* i.e.. knowledge combined with the purity of the soul, and Devaki is divine nature. His birth took place at Mathura which is a land of worldliness. Thus God, who is the highest Love, could not make this city, His residence. A place which is full of spirituality and devotion is required, and that is why Krishna, immediately after His birth, is taken to Gokula and Brindavan. Gokula is a spiritualised body with the mind and senses, fully under the control of the soul, or the land of spirituality, and Brindavan the land of immaculate love, joy and devotion. Here Krishna enjoys His sports with the young, and tends His cows with cowherd boys. This means he teaches them how to discipline their senses. He kills some demons in the form of birds, animals and serpents i.e. He teaches men how to annihilate the evil tendencies of mind or sins that thwart spiritual development of the soul and become a hindrance in God-realisation. Having thus taught the value of self discipline, purity of mind and character, in order to uplift them further, He plays upon His flute which is symbolical of the knowledge of God as Absolute and Highest Love to the souls aspiring for the Divine Bliss. He steals away the clothes of the young cowherd girls. This implies that the aspirants of God-realisation should be free from their worldly connections. It is after this stage that the soul can hope to reach the highest plane of the participation in the *Rasa Lila* with God. *Rasa Lila* is a mystic dance which the devotees participate in their exalted conscious and hightened vision of Divine message. It is the stage in which the individual soul is in tune with the music of the Infinite's flute. To quote the words of Swami Abhedanand "The implication of Rasalila is symbolic not visible on the surface. The Vrajalila of Shri Krishna is really a picture of spiritual struggle and ecstasy of realisation, which aspirants have at the consummation of their tireless waiting and eager longing, when the Blessed Lord vouchsafes His kind presence in the inner sanctuary of their heart. Rasa lila shows the realisation of the highest souls with God. The love of the Gopis for Krishna is not earthly but is heavenly, transcendental, and pure. There can be nothing sordid, nothing carnal when the spirit dances with the spirit. It is in other words a state of Salvation known as *Sayujya-a* fellowship of the soul in the Divine play, a sort of God union. It is *Alaukika*, super natural and supersensual. It is achieved as the highet realisation of God.''

In short, Shri Krishna, in the Hindu Mythology and the Vaishnava literature and Art, is representative of the highest form of God as Love and Bliss. He is the *Ananda Swarupa* or *Rasa-form* of God. Though he incarnates himself as a human being, he is not human. His body has no material elements or qualities. Incarnation of God as Krishna is the manifestation of the absolute joy and beauty on the physcial plane, without any materiality or worldliness. Even as such, He has His Divinity.

Krishna as Love or Bliss

The T. U. describes Brahman as Truth, Knowledge and Bliss. The Bliss-form of God is characterised as Rasa and Bliss or joy. This is revealed through a sentiment of love. It is the manifestation of a permanent emotion of love which rises, in the human mind with reference to any object, known as support (*Alambana*) and is stirred up by circumstances known as *Uddipana Vibhavas* and revealed physically as tears, laughter, paleness, horripilation, trembling, swooning etc. called *Anubhavas* and mentally in the form of temporary feelings like remorse, dejection, anxiety etc. called *Vyabhichari* or *Sancharibhavas*. It is not production, nor inference but revealation or manifestation of some permanent emotion in combination with the above *Vibhavas* (excitants), *Anubhavas* (physical conditions,) and *Vyabhicharibhavas*, (temporary mental conditions). According to the aestheticians, there are 8 principal emotions *Sathayibhavas*, which are revealed through the above accessories in the form of 8 *Rasas*. These 8 *Rasas* are the Rasas of love (*Shringar*), Pathos ((*Karuna*), Humour (*Hasya*), Heroic (*Vira*), wonder (*Adbhuta*), Terror (*Bhayanaka*), Anger

(*Raudra*) and Repulsion (*Bibhatsa*). To these, some add peace (*Shanta*) and Parental love (Vatsalaya). Like Truth and knowledge these *Rasa-forms* are abstract, as forms of God, but they are experienced mentally. Of these *Rasas*, the *Rasa* of Love is regarded as the highest form of God. It is experienced in the condition of union or separation from one's object of love.

Love relation has many varieties depending on the relation of the lover with the object to be loved. The relation may be any of the kinds of (1) Parents and children. (2) Brothers and brothers; Sisters-Sisters, Brothers-sisters. (3) Masters and servants. (4) The Teachers and pupils. (5) The Husband and the wife. (6) The lover and the beloved. (7) A friend and a friend.

Devotion as love is expressed in any of the above relations towards God. But of all these relations, relation between a husband and a wife is considered the highest as it unites the two persons permanently during their life-time, and both stand by each in weal and woe, with unshaken trust. Their love is constant, and they enjoy confidence of each other, but this love is very often the result of social convention. Very often the married people keep up a show of love. Again, this love is cold without warmth. It is not tested. The love of those who are attracted to each other not by social convention, but by the inner urge of their heart, has always proved superior to conventional love in its sincerity, warmth, selflessness, steadiness and strength, in resisting opposition and undergoing sufferings. It comes out triumphant from all trials and tribulations. For love to God, the lover's love is considered as an ideal. The Bhakti schools advocate this type of love to the devotee to think himself as a beloved and God as a lover. Suffism accepts this ideal, reversing the order i.e. the devotee to be a lover and God to be a beloved. Christianity recognises the relation of a bride and a bridegroom. God's concept as love is, no doubt, an abstract one, only a mental experience; but God is experienced concretely, according to the Bhakti schools in the relation of lovers, of whom the devotee as God's beloved, offers love to God. *Pushti Bhakti* accepts this ideal. A *Pushti* devotee loves God and lives for the love of God. If he does not get that love, he feels unhappy. For the attainment of God's grace, this love ought to be experienced in the state of separation, through ten mental experiences in the growth of devotion viz. the fascination of eyes (*Chakshuraga*). 2. rememberance of God (*Manahsanga*), 3. Desire of meeting Krishna (*Sankalpa*) 4. Keeping vigilence at night (*Jagaran*) 5. Emaciation of the body (*tanuta*) 6. Repulsion of pursuits of worldly objects (*Vishayadvesha*) 7. Abandonment of shame (*lajjatyaga*) 8. Madness (*Unmada*) 9. Swooning (*Murchana*) and 10. Death (*marana*). These are, generally, experiences of a true lover, when the object of love, whom she deisres to meet, delays his coming to her. The same experiences are gone through by a devotee for God during separation. In these experiences, death is the last stage, but in the *Bhakti Marga*, God does not let His devotee die without blessings to him, in the form of His revelation. The last stage of love is the stage of enjoying God's blessings. If God would not reciprocate the devotee's love by revealing Himself before him, it would be cruelty on the part of God. But God is merciful, He is perfect Bliss, and He reveals His Bliss-form before the devotee, when love experience reaches the last stage, when the love is sufficiently tested and proved worthy of acceptance by God. So the above ten experiences in the experience of Divine Love with slight variations in their nomenclature are known as (1) Enchantment of eyes (*Dragruchi*) (2) memory (*Smriti*) (3) Desire (*Abhilasha*) (4) Agony *Udvega* (5) Disease (*Vyadhi*) (6) Muttering words without any sense (*Pralapa*). (7) Madness (*unmada*) (8) Rigidity, Unconsciousness, Stupidity (*jadata*) (9) Swooning *Murchhana* (10) Complete absorption of self-love in love for God (*Tanmayata*). The first four experiences come under *Sneha*-attraction stage of love, 5 to 7 under *Asakti*-attachment stage, Nos. 8 & 9 under *Vyasana* which is followed by the last which is the stage, when the devotee supposes himself on the brink of death, but he is rescued from it by God. God recognises his love and reciprocates it. The devotee is no longer kept in the state of suspense. His trial is over. He has, no more, to suffer the pangs of separation. God now blesses him, and accepts him as His own, and keeps his soul in His proximity; so that it can enjoy the fruit of His love viz. participation in the bliss of God.

As stated before, Vallabhacharya has mentioned only three stages of devotion during its growth—*Sneha*, *Asakti* and *Vyasana*; but this *Vyasana* includes *Tanmaytata*. It is clear from Vallabhacharya's words in *Bhakti Vardhini*, that when the devotion grows into *Vyasana*, the fruit desired is obtained.

It is the characteristic features of Vallabhacharya's path of devotion, that he treats devotion, not as an emotion, but as a sentiment (*Rasa*) identifying it with the sentiment of Love—but love for God.

Devotion as Rasa or a Sentiment.

The theory of Rasa or a [Sentiment has been dealt with, in the works of poetics, by writers, sach as Mammata, Vishvanatha, Anandvardhan, Jagannath etc. According to them generally there are 8 Rasas—viz. Those of Love, Humour, Pathos, Anger-Heroism, Wonder, Repulsion and Terror. The dramatical works usually contain any of these Rasas as a chief one. When they are compelled by the necessity of a dramatic effect, they take liberty of employing other Rasas, but only as accessories to heighten the effect of the chief Rasa. The poets have added the sentiment of quietude or peace, Shanta Rasa, to the above list. The chief Rasa of the Mahabharata and the Ramayana is the Shanta Ras. Later rhetoricians have added to the above list the Rasa of filial affection-Vatsalya Rasa. But none of them has recognised Bhakti as a Rasa.

Though these rhetoricians differ among themselves regarding the number of Rasas, they agree on excluding Devotion to the Divinity from the list of the Rasas. In their theory of Rasa no place is assigned to the Sentiment of Devotion. It is on the contrary technically termed "Bhava".

They assert that Devotion being love to the Divinity must be regarded as Bhava and not Rasa. The followers of Chaitanya know it as Madhura Rasa.

This theory of devotion as a Sentiment has been discussed by Goswami Shri Pitamberji in his independent piece of writing under the title 'The Bhakti Rasatva Vada' (vide Vadawali p. 202). In this small work, he first of all states objections to the above theory from the standpoint of an opponent and then establishes his own theory, supporting Devotion as Rasa, and refuting the objections on technical grounds. The opponent's arguments against the theory may be briefly put as under :—

(1) Devotion is not known as Rasa either in the Vedas, Puranas or poetical compositions; because the works on the poetics which specially deal with the theory of Rasa define Rasa as a permanent emotion (Sthayi Bhava), manifested in mind through the operation of Vibhavas, Anubhavas and Sancharibhava—time and circumstances, physical effects, and temporary mental effects. Devotion to the Divinity does not come under this definition.

(2) As devotion has its aim, only propitiation of the Divinity, it is identical or synonymous with either knowledge, worship attended with meditation or the nine-fold type of devotion. But neither of these acquires the character of Rasa. Devotion as knowledge cannot become Rasa, because it has no permanent emotion. It is a temporary state lasting only for three minutes and not beyond them. It is only a momentary state and as such it cannot rise to the state of Rasa. Worship, having no emotion as its basis, cannot, for the same reason, become a Rasa. It lacks the chief ingredient of a Rasa, viz. Sthayi Bhava which is a seed or a germ out of which Rasa of any kind springs and grows as Rasa. The nine-fold deovtion consisting of Shravana (Listening to God's glorious deeds or Lilas), Kirtana (Reciting them), Smarana (Remembering them), Vandana (Bowing to the Deity's image), etc. also cannot separately, be held as Rasa, since, these are nine, and they all cannot constitute a permanent emotion of one Rasa. Accordnig to the Rasa theory, each sentiment must have a specific emotion of its own. Many emotions cannot enter into the composition of one particular Rasa. Multiplicity of emotions disturbs the integration or harmonious blend of the Vibhavas, Anubhavas and Sanchari Bhavas. Again in the operation of Kirtana Bhakti and Vandana Bhakti, the mind does not play its role expressive of devotion. It functions only with the organs of action. It is therefore wrong to assume presence of Rasa in it. So the devotion of the Nine-fold type cannot be assumed as Rasa.

(3) It is a misnomer of term to call or define devotion as love. What is known as love is nothing but a desire. 'Rasa' on the contrary has nothing to do with desire. It is independent of it. A lover who loves his beloved does not wish for anything from him or her, by way of reward. The

love is generally offered by one to another for its own sake. Devotion is not such love.

(4) If Devotion is Rasa, then, it must be experienced by the devotees like other sentiments. The sentiment of love of a lover of his beloved is experienced by him physically and mentally. Similarly sentiments of pathos, wonder, repulsion, terror etc. are experienced by those who come under their spell. The mind of the devotee, during the act of devotion, becomes fixed in God. It does not experience any thrill or ecstasy.

(5) The act of devotion differs from the love of lovers or of the husband and the wife or from the filial affection. It is bereft of love.

(6) It is not right to cite the example of the cowherdesses who enjoyed love of Krishna as a devotional act. Their love is only passion and not devotion. It may be treated as erotic Rasa (Shringara). For these reasons, Devotion cannot be considered as Rasa. It should be, however, known as 'Bhava' which is the term used for its description by the rhetoricians.

Shri Pitambarji replies to the above objections, in his work as under :—

(1) It is true that the rhetoricians have not recognised Devotion as a Sentiment but designated it as Bhava; but the teachers of the Bhakti School have, one and all regarded it as Rasa and it is separately designated as Bhakti Rasa.

(2) It has also a Sthayibhava (permanent emotion) similar to other Rasa and it is love for God.

(3) It cannot be identified with knowledge or worship or its nine-fold type. It is different from them, because they do not reveal permanent 'emotion' which is absolutely necessary for the rise of the Rasa.

(4) Devotion is not a desire, but it is love, pure love for God. The devotee does not desire anything from God except His Love. He neither wishes for any worldly gains, heavenly happiness, the Yogic powers or liberation. It is disinterested love like the love of a mother for her child.

(5) It is not true to say, that the love-type of devotion is not experienced by the devotees. Just as a sentiment of love or pathos is sttirred by the circumstances or occasions etc., and its effects are felt both, physically and mentally, by those in whom the permanent emotion peculiar to that Rasa lies deep in their heart, so also, similar experience is felt by the devotees for God, during the functioning of devotion. Occasions of union or separation induce the Devotion, according to the Shruti passages occurring G.T.U. and the Bhagvata III-25-32. It is a sort of mental tendency, permanently directed to God. It is Mnah Kalpana or a Swabhawiki Vritti—natural tendency. This tendency is nothing but the emotion—a Sthayibhava. Shandilya's definition of Devotion as Supreme-incessant love for God is based on the Atma-rati (Love for God) occuring in the Kathopnishad. Narada's definition of Devotion as supreme and inviolable love preceded by the knowledge of the greatness of God, leads to the same conclusion that Bhakti is a Rasa with love or Rati as its Sthayibhava, and God as its support (Alambana Vibhava). It is not temperory. It works its effect on the body and mind of the devotee for a pretty long time. In the state of separation from God, it is terminated only by God becoming visible. Even then, it does not come to an end. Only its role of functioning changes. It is not dependent on any external conditions or causes and it neither augments nor diminishes, but is uniformly of the same nature. In every kind of love-relation, if it is emotion of love some kinds of physical and mental effects are experienced by the person having love relation towards the object of love expressed in the acts of kissing, embracing, horripilation of hair, trembling of the body, shedding tears etc. physically, and sorrow, joy, jealousy, reverence etc. mentally. In short, the Rasa of Devotion has like other Rasas, its Sthayibhava, Anubhava and Sancharibhava.

Because Devotion also has 'Love' as a Sthayibhava, it is wrong to identify it with the so called erotic Rasa which is the term usually used by the rhetoricians for the love of worldly lovers. Pitambarji cautions the readers against considering the Bhakti Rasa and the worldly erotic Rasa as one. The worldly erotic Rasa is not a Rasa at all. It is only Rasabhasa-appearance of Rasa. It is Bhakti alone which is a real Shringara Rasa. Any sort of devotion which expresses itself in the form of some kind of love to God, subsisting between the love of a bride and bridegroom, the love of parents and the child, the love of a friend and a friend, etc. deserves to be termed as Bhakti Rasa.. The same is true with respect to the devotee's experience of love in relation to God.

The Bhagavata I-1-3 denomenates it Bhagavat Rasa. It adjoins the readers to drink it frequently till the end of life. Bhakti Rasa is a fruit. It should not be confounded with the erotic sentiment which deals with the sexual love of worldly persons. The love of the devotee has nothing of the kind of lust or sexuality in it. It does not crave for the gratification of sexual pleasures. It is the love of the spirit for God, whom it loves as a lover. The devotion of a devotee is transfigured into love for the Divinity. Shri Vallabhacharya characterises it as Bhagvat Rasa i.e. the Rasa which is experienced by the devotee in relation to God. One may call it by any other name; but it is no other than the Bhakti Rasa. Yogi Gopeshvarji pursues the subject in his 'Bhakti Martanda' and lends support to Shri Pitambarji's above theory of Devotion as a sentiment.

The love element in religious life is noticed in Christianity and Suffism also. Although human, in delineation and expression, it is divine love transcending every thing human. In the songs of Solomon, God is represented as a lover. Jesus Christ himself taught it, by a parable that the soul, seeking God, should regard God as a bridegroom and herself as a bride. St. Bernard, one of the greatest saints of Christian Church says in his "A fragment of a Fragment" that the love of God and that of the soul can be expressed in a way so perfectly as by the mutual love of the bride and the bridegroom. Developing the same idea further, he says, that although there are many kinds of love, such as, fatherly, motherly, sisterly, brotherly, friendly, etc., but the love of the Spouse is the highest because it is not selfish. She loves her husband (lover) for love's sake only. A Christian mystic Ruysbroek by name, also emphasises the love relation between the soul and God as that between a bride and bridegroom in his book "Spiritual Neuptials". It is well known that the famous Sufi poets of Persia used the language of love with reference to God. They loved God as a Beloved (Mashuka) i.e. in the form of a female lover and the devotee loving as a male lover.

Vallabhacharya's conception of devotion is based upon the Bhagavata, which is an exposition of the idea of devotion in the Upanishadas. The C.U. says that one who feels love (*Rati*) for God and enjoys sport (*Krida*) with God is the best of the souls, shining most in its light. According to this, feeling love and participaing in the sport with God, is the chief end of devotion. Krishna's dance with the *Gopis* is only Symbolical representation of the soul's experience of love with God. It is not the love of the flesh but the most exalted love of divine character.

Philosophy of Rasalila (The Dance Sport of Krishna)

Krishna's Rasalila with the Gopis form the subject of the Bhagawata Book X, Chapters 26 to 32. Vallabhacharya charaterises that part as *Tamas Fala Prakarana*. Krishna's dance with the milk maids is regarded by Vallabhacharya as the fruit of their love, which culminated into Sarvatmabhava. It is illustrative of the Shriti which lays down that the soul should sport and enjoy dalliance with Him. This is symbolical of perfect *Nirodha*. This portion dealing with the Dance of Krishna with the Gopis has been much misunderstood by those who have not understood the nature of Divine love. Vallabhacharya, in his commentary called *Subodhini,* has explained its significance at great length. Some have criticised it as lust, but Vallabhacharya has removed all misconceptions about it and explained its real nature which is divine love and not lust. Before forming any judgment about it, it should be noted that the love of the Gopis for Krishna was the love of superior souls for God. The author of the Bhagavata describes it as a way of enjoying God's love. Krishna is not only a historical person, but He is to be believed as representation of perfect Bliss or Love in a concrete form. The philosophy underlying it will be understood, if this truth is well grasped. In short, it is a symbolical representation of God's dance with souls, and through it, soul's participation in God's bliss. It is a Divine Play.

We may note the following points to maintain that the love described in the *Rasalila* chapter of the Bhagavata is not lust but divine love.

(1) The Bhagavata which describes *Rasalila* of Krishna with the Gopis is respected as a religious book, on equal status with the Vedas, the Gita, Brahma Sutras and other works. So the work, which is religious in character, will refrain from describing scenes of lust causing the degradation of the soul.

(2) The aim of this work is to free men from worldly bondage and restore their divinity; so that they may enjoy Bliss of God.
(3) Krishna is not a human personage but is God, Supreme God-Brahman of the Upanishads and Purushottama of the Gita. So the *Rasalila* of Krishna represents in fact the *lila* of God.

(4) It is beyond imagination that Shuka, who narrates the account, being a *Yogin* who has renounced the world from his childhood, and who is a celebate and has realised Brahman, can commit an error of describing lust.

(5) The very fact that *Parikshit* who is in danger of immediate death from a snake *Takshaka* and to whom this account is narrated by Shuka, listens to it without any protest, is a sufficient proof that the love described is not lust but divine. A man who is aware of his immediate death will not listen to the narration of illicit love.

(6) The epithets used for Krishna in the Bhagavata such as *Purusha Bhushan* (ornament of men), '*Janardan* (Destroyer of sins), *Achyuta* (Indestructible), (*Bhagawana* 10-20-38, 10-30-32. 10-33-7), *Parmatman* (Supreme God -10-29-11), *Yogeshvareshvara* (Master among masters of *Yoga*-10-29-16), *Atmaram* (one who plays in the souls (10-29-41) are significant in the sense that such a character will not set up an ideal of immoral life for other people.

(7). The Gopis with whom Krishna enjoyed the *Rasalila* (Dance) are not women but perfect souls, who have given up pursuit of lust and dedicated everything to Krishna as God and accepted Him as their Master (10-29-31). The whole account is a symbolical representation of the Bliss enjoyed by the divine souls (Gopis) with God.

(8) The Gopis do not love Krishna as a son of Yashoda but as God who is a seer of the hearts of men (*Antaratman*) (10-31-4). Their love is for God only and therefore it is not lust.

(9) The word 'Gopi' is explained as one who has either protected or controlled one's senses. In Sanskrit 'Go' means the 'senses'. Male controllers are Gopas and the female are Gopis. Of these controllers or protectors of senses, females are higher than males because their love is deeper and more capable of sacrifice and undergoing sufferings. The Gopi-love is an example to suggest that to enjoy God's love, a devotee should possess supreme love which transcends all other kinds of love and is free from sensuality, selfishness, and characterised by itensity and solidarity.

(10) As Krishna is God, He is free from lust and represents Divine love. This being so, the Gopis by enjoying God's love are lustless (*Nishkama*). Their love is like parched seed, which if sown, will not grow. The gopis have love, but not lust.

(11) If it were lust, gods would not have hailed them by flowers.

(12) If Krishna's behaviour was immoral, how is it that, no one from Gokula protested against it? Even the husbands of the Gopis did not object to Krishna's love affair.

(13) The author of the Bhagavata explaining the purport of *Rasalila* says that, it is intended to draw souls into the path of the highest devotion to God, to purify the heart and make the hearers fit for God's love. If in the words of the author, it is intended as a means of attaining devotion for God, how can that love be lust? (10-33-40)

(14) Even Uddhava, the best of spiritual thinkers, pays highest tribute of praise to the Gopis, for their love for Krishna. (*vide* Bhramara Gita in the Bhagavata 10-47-63.)

(15) If it is supposed that God's love is divine but that of the Gopis is lust, the law of love requires that unless there is similarity in the nature of love between the lovers, it cannot be reciprocated. But we know that God has reciprocated it. It is, therefore, divine. (16) The *Rasalila* delineats Krishna's dance which has nothing impure in it. *Bharata*, who was a great sage and a first eminent author of the Natyashastra says that it is a means of attaining God. This supports that, it is pure.

(17) Again, if it were lust, then it cannot be practised in a group with other Gopis. Lust is satisfied individually and in private. Here it is open in the presence of other Gopis.

(18) This *Rasalila* description is included in the 10th Book of the *Bhagavata* dealing with *Nirodha-Lila* i.e. the *Lila* of God by which, senses and mind of the seekers of divine life are withdrawn from worldly objects and turned to God.

(19) This particular portion of the Bhagavata, descriptive of *Rasalila* is regarded as a fruit of devotion by the author.

(20) In the Karika portion which is added to the account of *Rasalila* as a prelude to it, Vallabhacharya says that its object is to make God's chosen souls participators in His bliss of devotion. This bliss of devotion known as *Bhajananda* is superior to *Brahmananda*, which is the fruit of knowledge and which implies immersion in Brahman. The Gopis were higher souls. They did not want liberation of *Brahmananda* type but wanted *Bhajananda*, which is higher than that. God, by His grace, lifted them from *Brahmananda*; so that they could enjoy *Bhajanananda.*

(21) The very first verse of the *Rasalila* account begins with the words that even God (Bhagavan) though Himself delight-incarnate (*Atmarama*) desired to have pleasure of dance with His devotees. The last verse ends by saying that the dance of Krishna with the Gopis is the dance of God Vishnu who is all pervasive. From the first and the last verses, it is clear that this dance of Krishna is the dance of God and of none else. The Bhagavata deliberately uses the words *Bhagavan* and *Vishnu* for Krishna.

(22) The Bhagavata (10-29-15) says that God can be approached either by passion, anger, fear, love, unity and friendship, if these are concentrated in God alone. There are examples of persons, who have attained God by directing their anger, sex-passion and fear etc. to God. They became purified and were accepted by God.

(23) On listening to the flute notes of Krishna, the Gopis left their houses and went to meet Krishna, on the bank of the river Yamuna. It was a dark night. He advised them to return homes and serve their families. They refused to go saying that they have no charm for worldly pleausres. They belong to God and not to the world. They would remain with God and serve Him. Since they have completely renounced the world, they would remain as God's. servants[1] They are not women but the souls longing for God.

---

[1] Bhag. 10-29-31

They have no relatives other than God. The S.U. says "God is the Deity among the deities, Lord among Lords and Husband among the husbands". So they accept God alone as their husband (10-29-32). Their love has nothing to do with lust or sensuality. They are sick of carnal pleasures. They care neither for heavenly happiness, nor liberation. To them the worldly relations are sources of misery, for their love is not constant. God's love is constant. It is perennial joy. If God will not accept their love and send them back to the world, not that they only will not feel themselves happy, but it will be impossible for them to live. They lived so long only in the hope that their love would be reciprocated by God's love. After this reply of the Gopis, Krishna had to yield to them. Their love having been proved true and most precious, God granted their wish for a Dance with Him. This is the dance of God with His chosen souls. It is a dance not in the usual sense but in symbolical sense of enjoying God's love by the divine souls in union with God. It is illustrative of the *Shriti*, which says that the soul should love God (*Atmarati*), should sport with God (*Atma Kridah*) and should enjoy dalliance with Him.

(24) In the Bhagavata, Parikshit listening to the *Rasalila* description, raised a doubt, whether it was not immoral and an irreligious act of Krishna and the Gopis.-Shuka replied that it was the dance of God with His Divine souls. So, the enjoyment of love by God and the souls is not irreligious. The laws of morality are meant for men in their relations with men. Ordinarily, these laws must be conformed by all the individuals, living in society, otherwise social life will be upset. But as every law has an exception, there are exceptions to it. There are occasions when the saintly persons and the ascetics have to transgress these laws for specific reasons. In the same way, God does transgress these laws for the sake of Divine souls for bestowal of His grace on them. He accepts their love, provided it is purest even though, it may be expressed by any channel.[1]

(25) According to one explanation, God is Love (*Rasa*) and the Gopis are powers by which love for God is manifested. Radha

---

[1] Bhag. 10-33-34.

is an internal power (*antaranga*) of Love and the Gopis, external ones. The internal power is inseparable from Love. It is in Love as its *Siddha Shakti* (accomplished power). The Gopis are *Sadhya Shaktis* which have to be revealed by God, when in full play in unison with the devotees' souls. The Dance signifies only the full play of those powers in the manifestation of Love in the devotee's heart.

(26) Vallabhacharya in his *Subodhini* commentary writes that the Gopis being in human forms, God has assumed human form for the dance (*Krida*), simply to bestow His grace on the devotees. Otherwise He cannot bestow His grace on them. (*Vijatiya tesham Visvaso no bhavet. Tato tatha manusyangrahay maniso deho pradarshitah*).

(27) Shri Vallabhbhacharya proves that the love of the Gopis is divine, by the following reasons:

(1) God with whom their love is to be enjoed is divine. God would not enjoy love of the Gopis, if they are not divine.

(2) Love has to be enjoyed on an equal plane. If the love of the Gopis is worldly, it cannot be enjoyed by the divine love of God. Earthly love needs earthly love for satisfaction in enjoyment and reciprocation. If it is argued, that the love of Krishna and the Gopis was earthly, the Bhagavata's belief of Krishna as God must not be credited. It is misreading the Bhagavata.

(3) If it were earthly love, the result would be (Samsara-) getting children etc.; but, nowhere, the Bhagavata says that the Gopis had children by Krishna.

(4) The right thing to believe is that just as the Gopis have love, so God has love for them, divine in the case of both.

(5) Although the form in which divine love of the Gopis with God is expressed in a similar manner as that of the worldly love, it is not worldly. It may be expressed by kissing, embracing, dancing, singing etc, and yet it is is not identical with the worldly love. The form of expression is the same; yet it is different from the worldly love.

(28) Explaining the significance of the *Rasalila* in the Bhagavata all the commentators have recognised the divine nature of the love of the Gopis. None has denounced *Rasalila* of Krishna.

Shridhara says that its object lies in spiritual development from worldly pleasures. Jiva Goswamy thinks that its object is to purify worldly love by freeing it from pride. Shri Dhanapati sees its significance in getting mastery over worldly love. The author of 'Padaratnavali' thinks that it teaches that flawless devotion is the cause of liberation.

(29) The very title 'Bhagvata' means that it is the work on God. Such a work will not describe illicit love.

(30) The author says that it is intended for those who have renounced the world. This is sufficient to prove that the *Rasalila* is not immoral.

In this connection it is worth while to quote the following extract from the book on Vallabha by a Roman Catholic writer and a scholar.—The Rev. Fr. P. Johanns S.J.[1]

"It is in the tenth canto of the Bhagavata Purana that the *Rasa* experience of the milk maids is set forth. To our great astonishment, however, we find out that the *Rasa* proper described to this highest experience is described in terms of Kama or sexual love. But we must not forget the following points.

(1) This *Kama* or lust is *Alaukika* (Divine), supernatural. It has nothing to do with love born of the material gunas. You may call it lust, but then you must remember that it is the lust of a spirit lusting after the spirit. Besides the term *Kama* or lust is not adequate, For, worldly lust is set forth as an (*Abhasa*), mere material reflection or shadow of a divine joy.

(2) Hence the love-play of Krishna with the Gopis is symbolical. It is we who look at it with Prakritic eyes and mind, who find in it worldly features, and it is only when the highest grace of God works in our souls and fills us with divine light and warmth, that we wake up to the divine meaning of this apparently amorous conduct of the Gopis and Krishna.

(3) Moreover, this *Kama* of the Gopis included the highest appreciation of God. They gave up everything for His sake. Their love was a total surrender which human love may somehow

---

[1] Pages 65-66

illustrate but can not represent fully. There was no touch of selfishness in their love. They loved Krishna for His own sake and lived themselves only in Krishna."

Shri Vallabhacharya drives at the same conclusion in the interpretation of the love of the Gopis. He does not understand it as *Kama* or lust but as pure love. From the above pages we have learnt that the only means for the attainment of God in the *Suddhaadvaita* system is devotion, and that too of the love-type called *Pushti Bhakti*. It is the highest means. Really speaking it is not a means but an end in itself. It does not depend upon self effort, but upon God's grace.

Development of the concept of devotion by Vitthaleshaji and his successors.

From the above discussion of Vallabhacharya's concept of devotion, it will be noted that Vallabhacharya bases it on two works-1. Narada's Bhakti Sutras and 2. Shandilya's Bhakti Sutras. According to the first, devotion is preceded by knowledge of the greatness of God and according to the second it is independant. Both these works lay emphasis on predominance of love. But the first, requiring knowledge as a precedent, is a means and the second, being pure love only, is an end, because it asserts that the devotee has not to ask for any reward for his devotion but only love for God. That love itself is his reward. The first kind is explained in the *Tattva Dipa Nibandha* and the Second in his work *Bhakti Vardhini.* What is known as mental service is nothing but the devotion of the second type, which is resorted to by the devotee when not engaged in Divine service.

Vitthaleshaji, Vallabhacharya's son, accepts only the second type of devotion. In his *Bhakti Hetu,* he says that the devotion as a means is only for the *Maryada* Souls, who need knowledge as a support to their devotion, but for the *Pushti* Souls, only the second kind of devotion serves the purpose. The *Pushti* Souls depend entirely on the grace of God, which is independant of any means, except God's will. Vitthaleshaji says that God's grace is free and unconditioned. The souls in the *Maryada* path require the performance of the duties, purity of mind, devotion etc. for salvation. As the *Pushti* souls do not care for salvation, they are free from that obligation. They are expected to love God with all their love with complete dedication of every thing to Him; and God's grace will come of its on accord by God's will. The only condition required, if at all, is that the devotee should give his love to God, disinterestedly and only for His sake. God's grace is an effect without any cause. If there is any cause it is the will of God. God's will exists prior to devotion. It is also the sole cause of the rise of devotion in the devotee. This idea has been further explained in his another work, *Bhakti Hansa* and the same is distinctly clarified in the *Anu Bhashya*. There he analyses the concept of devotion into the *Pushti Bhakti* and the *Maryada Bhakti*, and demarcates one from the other, showing their specific characteristics. So the base of Vitthleshaji's concept of devotion is Shandilya's Bhakti Sutras, but he characterises Shandilya's Bhakti as *Pushti Bhakti*.

Purushottamji defines it, following Vallabhacharya, but he, is inclined to the view of Vitthaleshaji, in treating it as a sentiment or a *Rasa*.

Hariraiji knows only two types of devotion—(1) The devotion of resort to God's feet (*Dasya-Charan-Bhakti*) by surrender. It is taught by Narada (2) The devotion of intense love (Mukharavinda Bhakti) devotion of enjoying the bliss, by feasting one's eyes on the beauty of the face of God. It is taught by Shandilya and was experienced by the Gopis of Gokula. He makes also other two divisions namely (1) The Vedic type of devotion which leads to emancipation. It is preceded by the knowledge of the greatness of God as a creator, sustainer and destroyer of the universe and as Omniscient, Omnipresent and Omnipotent. It is also love preceded by knowledge. The above is a means in this kind of devotion and not an end. (2) The independent Devotion—this does not depend upon any means. It is spontaneous and is achieved by God's grace, and experienced during the state of soul's separation from God. This also, no doubt, presupposes the knowledge of the greatness of God, but it is not of God as a creator etc., but of God as a great lover. The first kind is theoretical and the second one, practical. In both the kinds, love is the dominant element. It cannot be devotion, if it has no love-element in it. But the love in the first case is only general love, in the second case it is a particular type of a woman's love for her husband.

Gopeshvara in his work '*Bhakti Martanda*' defines devotion as constant attachment to God. According to him it is not a kind of knowledge or faith or action or worship. It is pure love without an element of yearning or desire. Desire of any other kind has nothing to do with devotion. If devotion is coupled with any desire-even a desire for emancipation, it would be no love for God, but selfish love. Devotion is the whole hearted service to God with love and complete surrender to Him. Either Love must precede service or both should be simultaneous. He regards devotion as one of the sentiments affecting the mind and the body, with delight. Affection is the dominant phase in every experience of devotion to God. During the experience there may be the feeling of oneness on the part of the devotee with God, but this is only a temporary phase, because the soul of the devotee is not one with God in that state, but acquires likeness to Him and enjoys His bliss. The fruit of devotion is not merging into God, but enjoyment of His bliss as His co-partner, with existence as a separate entity.

Devotion has two types (1) as a fruit and (2) as a means to an end. The devotion of the first type is only of one kind. The second is of two kinds (1) As an integral part of knowledge and (2) As a direct means leading to emancipation. This is again classified as "The Qualified" and "The non-qualified". The qualified type of devotion is of three kinds (1) Mixed with knowledge (2) mixed with detachment and (3) Mixed with action.

The devotees of the *Pushti* School accept only the first kind of devotion i.e. the fruit kind—the fruit being God-realisation or enjoyment of God's bliss. The devotion as a means is meant for the devotees of the *Maryada* School. Gopeshvara enters into a long discussion to explain the exact connection of the word "devotion".

Thus, it will be seen that the original concept of devotion by Vallabhacharya, has during the course of its development undergone variations in meaning by the different scholars.

Liberation.

Liberation is considered as the goal or fruit of spiritual life either by knowledge or devotion. The concept of liberation as a goal has been accepted by all the Acharyas, although, the meaning of it differs with each one of them. It is a release from worldly bondage. But as regards the kind of release there are different opinions on this point. The release accoding to the Samkhya lies in dissociation of contact between *Prakriti* and *Purusha*, by complete cessation from the activities by the Purusha, and according to the *Yoga* system it lies in complete forgetness of the world, by controlling the tendencies of the mind by *Ashtanga Yoga* discipline. The meditation has two stages—(1) Meditation in a conscious state and (2) Meditation without consciousness. The second is a Supra-conscious concentration where meditator and the object of meditation are completely fused together. It is a state in which there is no consciousness of the object of meditation. The Naiyayika concept of liberation is absolute cessation of suffering, by right knowledge of the Reality, for which one must understand 16 *Padarthas* such as *Pramana*, *Prameya* etc. The Vaisheshikas emphasise the necessity of knowledge, but it is the knowledge of 7 *Padarathas* viz substance, quality, action, generality or universality, particularity, inherence (*Samavya*), and negation. To them, liberation is freedom of the soul from qualities in the substance-state without consciousness, which is a quality of the soul. The *Purvamimasakas* believe in sacrifice as a means for religious life. They say that by refraining from prohibitory and desirous actions, and by the true knowledge of the nature of the rituals which ought to be performed, according to the teaching of the Vedas, one will realise liberation i.e. non-attainment of birth. A released person has no rebirth. The heavenly bliss is not true liberation, because, when the stock of merits is exhausted by enjoyment in heaven, there is a fall from it. So it is no liberation. Liberation is the state of non-birth in the world. Shamkara's theory about liberation is that, it is a release of the soul from worldly bondage which accrues from removal of ignorance, by the knowledge of Brahman. It is of two kinds:

(1) Immediate liberation,-the liberation which is to be had during a life time by the knowledge state. (*Kaivalya-Moksha* or *Sadyomoksha*)

(2) The other kind is liberation got gradually, (*Krama Mukti*), first by reaching Brahma Loka through worship (Knowledge-work) and then getting it after a stay there for a pretty long time. This is known as *Sayujya Moksha.* At any rate Shankara considers the knowledge of Brahman as means of liberation. According to him,

the nature of Brahman is knowledge. So when ignorance is removed, true knowledge dawns and one cognises Brahman everywhere. It is a state of complete knowledge when the soul merges into the consciousness of Brahman, thereby its individuality is lost. The soul sinks into Brahman and becomes one with It. According to Ramanuja, liberation is to be got after the soul is released from body by death and reaches *Brahma loka*. There it experiences the state of likeness with Brahman. This is called *Sayujya Moksha.* The liberated soul in this state enjoys God. It is acquiring the God-state by the soul. The soul in this state becomes similar to God in all respects, except in having the power of creation, preservation and dissolution, and the power of being the inner ruler of the universe. Madhva, no doubt, admits that the soul becomes similar to God in a liberated state in some respects, yet its inferiority to God remains. There is a limitation to the soul's enjoyment of the bliss of God. He recognises four ways of bliss. (1) bliss of residence with God. (*Salokya*) (2) bliss of proximity of God (*Samipya*) (3) bliss of having external form like that of God (*Sarupya*) (4) and bliss of entering into the body of God and enjoying partial bliss (*Sayujya*). This last is the highest *Moksh* but even in it, there is no full enjoyment of bliss of the soul with God. Shamkara's theory of *Moksha* is not enjoyment of bliss. It is soul's absorption into Brahman. Ramauuja and Madhva regard Moksha as the state of enjoyment of bliss by soul in communison with God.

Let us now turn to Vallabhacharya's theory of liberation, which is explained in his *Tattva Dipa Nibandha* and in the *Anu Bhasya* on the Brahma Sutras. The fourth chapter of the Brahma Sutras deals with the topic of liberation. It is the fruit of love-type devotion, reaching condition of *Saravatmabhava*, in which all love of the soul is directed to God. It is the state of enjoying God's bliss, accruing from devotion to God. It is to be enjoyed with supernatural body, mind and senses having divine essence. It is not merging of the soul into God, but enjoying bliss with God as a separate entity as the *amsa* of God. The *Taittiriyopanisad* describes this bliss in a Shriti. 'It enjoys all desires with God'. So, according to the Upanishad, the state of liberation is the state of enjoyment of bliss, in which all desires are satisfied. This means that for enjoyment of

God's bliss, desires of enjoyment of God's love by the soul are not to be suppressed; but they have to be sublimated and directed to God. Whatever desires one has, they must be turned to God and satisfied by God. The devotee is free from worldly desires, but has desire for God's love. In liberation the desires are satisfied by God, who reciprocates soul's love. So it is participation of the soul in God's love with simultaneous participation of God with the soul. Since the soul has become divine, having gone through experience of *Sarvātma-bhāva,* God recognises it as His own and considers it fit for His grace.

It is said that devotional acts should be practised repeatedly.[1] The devotion should be offered to God's *Svarupa* (God himself in person) and not to a symbol or an idol. The image of God to a devotee is not an image but the form of God.[2] Sitting before God's Svarupa, one's mind must be concentrated on Him. By this, God will reveal Himself to him internally or externally and the devotee, then will express his love to God through conversation, kissing, embracing, sporting etc. But the realisation of this kind of fruit depends not upon the efforts of the devotee, but upon God's will. When God sees that the devotee's soul has become perfectly divine, God Himself comes to it and lifts it to His presence. This bliss in the case of *Pushti Bhakti* is to be enjoyed, as said above, by the same body which is transformed into a divine one. While enjoying God's love its senses with speech become merged into mind, the mind into vital breath and the vital breath into soul and the soul into God's. It does not become conscious of anything except the love of God.[3] The bliss enjoyed is indescribable.[4] In that state the soul acquires likeness with God without God's powers of creations, preservation, and destruction of the world. The likeness is in respect of the acquisition of God's qualities-greatness, potentiality, glory, beauty, knowledge and detachment and in respect of enjoyment of bliss.[5] It is the state of likeness to God (*Brahmabhava.*) The enjoyment of bliss follows in consequence of the souls becoming like God.

---

[1] B.S. 4-1-1. [2] B.S. 4-1-5. [3] B.S. 4-2-1. to 4. [4] B.S. 4-2-9

[5] T.D.N. 531.

This kind of liberation is secured in two ways : (1) by the efforts of soul and (2) by God's grace. The second is higher and it is a proof of God's Grace to the soul; because God of His own accord, without waiting for the soul's efforts, comes down to bestow grace on the soul.

The souls that have attained Brahman are also blessed with this kind of bliss, but then they are to be brought out from their state of immersion into Brahman.[1] This enjoyment of God with the souls takes place on the basis of equality.[2]

Like the flame of a lamp converting a wick, dipped in oil, into a flame, God enters the soul and makes it, a participator of His bliss.[3] Explaining the nature of liberation, Shri Hariraiji says:—Liberation means union of the soul with Krishna. It is two fold. (1) Attainable by the souls and (2) Attainable through God's grace. The union with God in a gradual process through service and devotion to God is called *Krama Mukti* or *Sayujya.* It is the soul's entry into God. God's entry into soul is called instantaneous liberation (*Sadyomukti*). The first is only liberation (*Moksha*), the second is supreme liberation (*Vara Moksha*).

Life after Death or Future Life :

Almost all countries and religions believe in future life or rebirth. The term future life may be understood either as rebirth or immortality—the future state of the soul after passing away from this life. Just as the present life is regarded as a result of the actions of a previous life, so also the next life, after the termination of this life, is regarded as a result of the actions done in this life. If this life, is spent in meritorious actions, the next life will be good and happy. The scriptures indicate three ways of life for the choice of the individual souls-the life of work, knowledge and devotion respectively.[4] In Gita[5] it is mentioned that all souls, even including Brahma, (the creator) are subject to rebirth but those who attain God have no rebirth. It refers to the two paths-the path of smoke or of sacrifices or rituals (*Dhumamarga*), and the path of light or self control. The B.S. III says that the soul that passes by the path of smoke journeying onwards through night, dark half of the month, six monthly period of the southward course of the sun, reach the moon and come down again to the world through clouds, rain, food etc. into the generative organ of a male and then into the womb of a woman. Rebirth is a sure destiny after some period, for those souls, who were attached to the sacrificial cult. If they performed the sacrifices with a desire of enjoying heavenly happiness, they would go to heaven and remain there until their merits are exhausted, but afterwards they have to come back.

---

[1] B.S. 4-4-1. [2] B.S. 4-4-21. [3] B.S. 4-4-15.

[4] B.S. III and B.G. VIII-17-27. [5] B.G. VIII-16.

The passage of journey of the ascetic's soul is by the path of light until led by the gods, the soul reaches Brahman. This is known as *Krama Mukti.* Such souls have no rebirth.

The souls that pursue life of pure knowledge and devotion have also no rebirth. Vallabhacharya mentions five goals for five kinds of souls.

1. Heavenly bliss and rebirth for the souls that have acquired merits by sacrificial and good works.
2. Gradual emancipation from worldly bondage for the ascetic souls.
3. Attainment of *Akshara* (Absorption into Brahman) for spiritual souls, who pursued knowledge of Immutable Brahman. This is known as Immediate liberation (*Sadyomukti*).
4. Attainment of supreme God for the devotional souls.
5. Participation in the enjoyment of God's bliss, by His grace, in His company for the special souls, who had loved God throughout their life with complete surrender and service.

These are God's selected souls. This is called *Sayujya Mukti.*

Souls engrossed in the worldly enjoyments only remain in this world without any hope of freedom. They are subjected to endless cycle of births and deaths. The demoniacal souls have to suffer heavy penalty of the terrors or endless unbearable miseries in the region of God of Death. For souls, devoted to works in this life, their future life is determined by their works, for, in their case, the Law of *Karma* or work does operate rigidly. In the case of the spiritual and divine souls attached to knowledge and devotion, the law of *Karma* has no application. New birth of each man depends upon his subtle body on his leaving the gross body. The subtle body is the reflex image of a man's personality in all its phases. It is this body, which carries with it a man's *Karmas* or works causing a new body.

The Rebirth theory is not only a Hindu Theory but it is believed in Jewish faith, and by Christian thinkers like Urigen and Jerome. Philosophers like Pythogoras and Plato have supported it. Schopenhaur expresses his faith in it. Sir WilliamJames admitting its usefulness says 'I am no Hindu, but I hold the doctrine of the Hindus concerning the future life to be incomparably more rational, pious and more likely to deter men from vice than the horrid opinions by Christians on punishments without end.[1] The Hindus however believe more in eternal life than in rebirth. All the scriptures emphasise the value of eternal life, which is a reward of knowledge and devotion. Of course, the term "Eternal Life" is interpreted variously. It means freedom from worldly bondage for ever and it is to be got by knowledge and devotion. Vallabhacharya being an advocate of the cult of devotion, recommends for his followers, freedom from worldly bondage by attaining the bliss of God. For such souls there is no rebirth. They remain with God in His proximity eternally and that is the permanently decided future of the Divine souls.

Universal Character of Vallabhacharya's Religion :

Prof. George Gallowany, in his work on the Philosophy of Religion, classifying the religions of the world, enumerates three main types:

(1) The Tribal Religion.
(2) The National Religion.
(3) The Universal Religion.

He mentions their specific features and points out their defects. Under the Universal Religion, he mentions only the Islam, Buddhism and Christianity. It is a wonder why the Hindu Religion is excluded from the list. Perhaps the writer must have misconceived it as the Religion of a particular race known as the Hindus. No doubt, it is the Religion of the

---

[1] The Brahma Sutras by Dr. Radhakrishnan p. 20.

V.-15

Aryans who are known as the Hindus; yet it is not exclusively of the Hindus. On account of its liberality and sympathetic attitude to all the races, and admission to it, of people from any race, it is unfair to exclude it from the list of the Universal Religion. Prof. Gallowany, although mentions Islam and Buddhism as Universal Religions, finds them wanting in salient features of the Universal Religion. Intolerance and allowing propagation of the creed by the sword (p. 140) is a main defect of Islam. As for Buddhism, no doubt it rises to the level of a universal religion, but its teaching of killing desires, suppression of the will to live and casting away of the fetters of senses, detracts it from its universality. It is opposed to progress in the worldly sense of the term. In the opinion of the writer, it is without any outlook for a brighter world. It is a negative religion. It is Godless, and yet Buddha is substituted for God. Christianity believes in God. It aims at the establishment of the kingdom of God, the kingdom in which all love each other as brothers.

The writer admits the claim of Christianity to its recognition as a Universal Religion, but it also has its defects. Its proselytising activity proves hostile to its universal characters. The Hinduism is an optimistic religion and never pessimist. It believes in tolerance towards others and is opposed to proselytisation. It does not attach as much importance to external forms as to the internal purity of the heart. It teaches love and nationality to all, irrespective of their caste, creed and colour. It is true that in the middle ages, the evil of untouchability had crept into it, but it was only a temporary phase indicative of the degeneration that set in it, during the foreign influence, but becoming conscious of it, the Saints, the Acharyas and social reformers made efforts to purify Hinduism by denouncing untouchability and admitting the untouchables to the Religion. After independence, untouchability has been removed by an Act of the Parliament, so that at present it is only a thing of the past. Untouchables- are put on par with men of other castes and accorded equal privileges of education, moral and social amelioration, as well as religious freedom.

The move for freedom in religion was started in the middle ages by the religious teachers of Vaisnavism constituting a major section of

Hinduism. Of those religious teachers, Vallabhacharya was one. His contribution to make his religion universal is the greatest.

We shall briefly note, here, a few features of its universality.

(1) It admits all men and women, irrespective of class or rank, to religious life, without discrimination.

(2) It is the religion of love for God and for all the creatures of God.

(3) It does not believe merely in the externals or the ceremonials of religion. It is mainly the religion of the heart.

(4) It does not believe in propagation or proselytisation.

(5) It teaches that all beings are forms of God and therefore, one must love all and hate none. Even an enemy should be respected and loved.

(6) It teaches tolerance towards, those who differ from us, even though they hate us bitterly.

(7) It teaches to love and treat women, not only as equals of men; but in devotional life as superiors to men.

(8) It does not denounce property, but it says that, it should be regarded not as personal property but as held by one, in trust as God's property, so it should be used in the service of God and for altruistic ends only. It is a sin to use one's property for one's own gratification. It respects both the rich and the poor equally, nay, the poor more than the rich.

(9) It forbids men from making religion a means of livelihood.

(10) It prefers a householder's life to an ascetic's life. One must live as a householder and do one's duty, incumbent on him as a social man and as a God-seeker. One is not to think of one's own happiness or of the happiness of one's own family, but of the whole world. A man's sphere of work must not be confined within the orbit of his family, but must be extended, so as to include the welfare of the whole world.

(11) Its teaching is that, doing one's duty is the duty done unto God. Helping one's neighbour or a stranger in a bonafide manner, in his woe, is doing duty unto God.

(12) It lays stress on disinterestedness in the performance of one's duty. It divides all duties into three classes: (1) Duty unto

one's own self, (2) Duty unto the society in the larger sense of the term and (3) the Duty unto God. The last is the most important, the first two are to be performed as the integral parts of the last.

(13) It believes that All is God, who is also transcedental, anda ll are related to God. So, whatever is done, relates to God. Every experience in life is to be thought as relating to God. It asks men to have faith in God, who is God of all. It also exhorts men to bear in mind that by good actions, God is pleased; and by bad actions, He is displeased.

(14) It teaches us to experience the Grace of God which comes to all who seek it, by living life nobly, disinterestedly, justly, enriched by love to all and free from evil passions like hate, jealousy etc.

(15) It teaches unity of all beings, through cultivation of love for God.

These are some of the features of Vallabhacharya's religion which are worthy of acceptance universally.

The gist of Vallabhacharya's religious teaching is that the goal of life is soul's participation in the Divine Bliss, which is higher than the spiritual bliss or liberation, and a sure means to it, is the devotion of the love-type. This devotion is not opposed to work and knowledge. On the contrary, it assimilates into its structure the elements of action and knowledge,-action for God expressed through divine service and knowledge of God in the form of Ananda or Bliss. This devotion is a spontaneous flow of the heart, which in the beginning is only very meagre; but in course of time reaches the climax, when the soul of the devotee sees God, face to face, and God lovingly accepts it as His own, embraces it as his beloved one and gives it the bliss of perfect union, from which thereis no return to the world. It is an eternal state of the enjoyment of the Divine Bliss. This is the essence of the *Pushti-Marga.*

CHAPTER IV

VALLABHACHARYA COMPARED WITH OTHER ACHARYAS

'Reality is one, but it is described variously by the learned.'
—Rigveda.

'He (God) is the One, the Creator of all, the Ruler of all, the Internal Soul of every being. He who makes His Oneness manifold. Thus sages who realise Him as the Soul of their souls, unto them belongs eternal peace, unto none else. He who, in this world of evanescence, finds Him who never changes, he who in this universe of death finds that One life, he who in this manifold finds that Oneness, and all those who realise Him as the Soul of their souls, to them belongs eternal peace, unto none else, unto none else.'

Vivekanand-Jnana-Yoga, p. 202

The various Vedic systems of Indian philosophy owe their existence to the 'Brahmasutras' of Badarayana, which was undertaken by him as the exposition of the philosophy of the Upanishadas, with a view to systematise it coherently, in one work, just to remove misunderstanding about the teaching of the Upanishadas. It represents the summary of the Upanishadas. Taking this work, as a base for their philosophical systems, the Acharyas, who are credited as the founders of particular philosophical Schools, each representing a particular Vedantic thought, wrote independent commentaries on it, for propounding their own views as understood by them. There have been many commentaries on it, but only those of the following commentators are chiefly known: (1) Shamkaracharya (A.D. 780) on Monism, (2) Bhasakara (A.D. 1100) on Unity-in-difference, (3) Ramanuja (A.D.1140) on Qualified Non-dualism (4) Madhva (A.D. 1238) on Dualism, (5) Nimbarka (latter half of the thirteenth century) A.D. on Dualism-cum Non-dulaism (6) Sri Kantha (A.D. 1270) on Qualified Non-dualism with Shiva as ultimate principle (7) Sri-Pati (A.D. 1400) on

Qualified non-dualism of the nature of unity in difference (8) Vallabhacharya (A.D. 1479) on Pure non-dualism (9) Vignan Bhikshu (A.D. 1600) on Dualism with unity of the soul with Brahman.

In this chapter, we shall briefly compare Vallabhacarya with other Acharyas; so that the readers will be able to distinguish Vallabhacharya's philosophical thought from that of others and estimate it themselves.

We shall, first of all, compare him with Shamkaracharya. Main differences in the teachings of these two Acharyas are given below:

Vallabhacharya	**Shamkaracharya**
1. Vallabhacharya's philosophy is characterised as Shudha-advaita. It is also known as *Brahmavada.*	1. Shamkaracharya's philosophy is known as *Kevaladvaita* or *Mayavada.*
2. To him, Brahman is both Indeterminate and Determinate. It is Indeterminate; because the qualities and form are negatived. Negation of attributes means negation of worldly qualities. Viewed positively Brahman is Determinate i.e. possessed of divine qualities. These two are the aspects of one and the same Brahman.	2. Brahman is Indeterminate, but due to *Maya* it appears as Determinate. Indeterminate Brahman is principal and determinate is secondary.
3. *Purushottama* is supreme God. He is superior to *Akshara Brahman.*	3. *Akshara Brahman* is the highest conception of *Brahman.*
4. Brahman is Being, Consciousness and Bliss. It manifests It self as a knower, knowable and knowledge.	4. Essence of Brahman is knowledge.
5. Brahman is a material as well as efficient cause of the universe.	5. Brahman has nothing to do with creation; but due to *Maya* it appears as a material and efficient cause.

6. *Maya* is an instrument by which God reveals the world from Himself. It is His divine power.	6. *Maya* is illusion or ignorance which is the cause of misapprehension of the world as world and not as Brahman.
7. Brahman is a substratum of the opposite qualities.	7. Brahman is destitute of qualities. The supposition of qualified Brahman is due to *Maya.* It is not real.
8. The world is a part of God's 'Being'. It is real.	8. The world is not 'being' but 'becoming' and appearance is due to *Maya.* It is phenomenal.
9. The world is not production but manifestation of God.	9. The world is a product, an appearance and not a manifestation.
10. The manifestation of the world from Brahman is not a modification, but an essence of Brahman.	10. The world is a modification.
11. *Anandamaya* (Bliss-form of God) is Brahman. It is Supreme God.	11. It is not Brahman, but a sheath.
12. Verbal Testimony is the only *Pramana* for knowledge about God i.e. the Vedas, the Gita, the *Brahma Sutras* and the Bhagavata, alone are authoritative. The *Mimansa*, the *Smriti works* and other works are also accepted, provided they do not conflict with the first four works.	12. Verbal Testimony i.e. the Vedas, the *Gita* and the Brahma Sutras, is no doubt considered authority, but reason and intuition are also accepted.
13. Souls are parts of God's consciousness. They are many and also knowers.	13. Souls are not parts of God but Brahman. They are supposed to be many, on account of ignorance. In fact they are Brahman, Their essence is knowledge. They are not knowers.

14. There is difference between *Jagat* (world) and *Samsara.* The world is God's work where as the the *samasara* is the work of the soul, under the influence of *Avidya.* The *Jagat* is real but the *Samsara* is unreal. The *Samsara* can be ended by the soul, but the *Jagat* canot be ended except by God.	14. There is no difference between the *Jagat* and the *Samsara.* Both are identical and unreal. Its apprehension can be ended only by removal of ignorance.
15. Devotion is the only means of the soul's union with God.	15. Knowledge is the only means for *moksha.*
16. *Moksha* is the state of soul's participation in the bliss of God.	16. *Moksha* means merging into Brahman.
17. Work and Knowledge are auxiliaries to Devotion only in the preliminary state.	17. Devotion is subsumed under knowledge. Work is accepted as an aid to knowledge, only for purification of mind.
18. Devotion is not a means but an end. It means love for God.	18. Devotion is a means and it is of nine-fold nature. It is subsidiary to knowledge in its highest stage.
19. The soul is not only a knower, but, also a doer and an enjoyer of the fruits of the the deeds.	19. The soul is neither a doer, nor an enjoyer, by its very nature. It seems to be so on account of ignorance.
20. Purpose of God's creation is His *Lila* or sport.	20. Brahman has no such purpose.
21. The relation of the soul to God is that of the part to the whole.	21. Shamkaracharya says, 'the soul and Brahman being identical the part and whole relation between them does not subsist.
22. The world is the physical (*Adhibhautika*) form of Brahman.	22. It is not any form of Brahman but simply an appearance.

23. He believes in *Avikruta parinama Vada*–theory of the change from God without modification.	23. He believes in *Vivarta Vada*, the theory of illusion.
24. All the means-such as work, sacrifice, worship etc. have their value in a religious life and they lead to fruit.	24. No other means, exeept knowledge, have any value. They are useful only in the initial stage of spiritual life.
25. The fruit, attainment of bliss of God, is positive.	25. The goal of *Moksha* attained by removal of ignorance through knowledge is negative.
26. The *Moksha* state is bliss ful. It is not simply release from the worldly bondage.	26. There is no bliss in the *Moksha* state.
27. He establishes non-dualism of Brahman, by holding that everything is Brahman. Even objects like jars etc. are non-different from God. They manifest God's particular attributes.	27. He establishes his theory of non-dualism by holding that the world is unreal. The object jars etc. are all unreal.
28. *Moksha* is either, by God's entrance in the soul or by soul's entrance in God. It is a state in which the soul's separate entity is not lost.	28. *Moksha* means identification of the soul with Brahman. It is a state, in which the soul's separate entity is lost.
29. He resorts to *Anyatha-Khyati*, as an explanation of wrong knowledge.	29. He resorts to *Anirvachaniya Khyati* to account for wrong knowledge.
30. Existence and non-existence of the world is explained as manifestation and non-maifestation of Brahman.	30. It is explained as imposition (Adhyaropa) or (Upadhi) adjunct of *Maya*.
31. The soul is *Anu*-infinitesimally small, but in the state of	31. The soul is not *Anu*. It is *Vibhu* (Pervasive). It seems

God-realisation, it attains likeness and also pervasiveness of God.	to be *Anu;* because of its contact with intelligence.
32. He accepts entire Veda as an authority for the knowledge of God.	32. He accepts only the *Upanishadas* as an authority. Here also he accepts only that part of the *Upanishadas* which support his theory of the Indeterminate Brahman.
33. Brahman as Supreme God, is not only Truth and Knowledge, but also Bliss or Love. Krishna reprsents this highest concept of Brahman.	33. Brahman is impersonal Krishna is personal God and as such inferior to Impersonal Brahman, the Absolute.
34. The inequalities in the world are explained by him as due to God's will or His *Lila.*	34. He attributes the inequalities to *Maya.*
35. Truth is both Absolute and relative. Relative truth is empirical. They are like two sides of a coin. Even empirical truth is as real as Absolute, ’only it is relatively real.	35. Truth is one and absolute. The empirical truth is only truth in name. It is not ultimately real.

Now we shall compare Vallabhacharya with Ramanujacharya. With Shamkaracharya he had many points of difference but with Ramanuja he has many points of agreement. The main points of difference with Shamkaracharya are his theory of Mayavada and the theory of two Brahmans, nature of the world, the souls and liberation. These were the main targets of attack by Ramanuja. Ramunaja was born in 1017 and he died in 1137. Bhaskara, who preceded Ramanuja had criticised Shamkara's theory of monism and upheld Bhedabhedavada, theory of identity and differences. Ramanuja advocated *Vishistadvaita* theory i.e. theory of qualified non dualism. Vallabhacharya differed from him in holding the Shudha-advaita theory of pure non-dualism.

The following are the chief points of comparison and difference between Vallabhacharya and Ramanuja.

1. Vallabhacharya accepts *Shuddhaadvaita*, Ramanuja, on the other hand, *Vishistadvaita* (qualified non-dualism).

2. Both agree that Brahman is a material and an efficient cause.

3. Both believe that Brahman is both Indetermiate (Impersonal) and Determinate (Personal)

4. Both reject Shamkara's Doctrine of Maya.

5. Both believe that the world is real.

6. To Vallabhacharya, Maya is a Divine Power; and to Ramanuja it is a wonderful power of God and dependent upon Him.

7. Vallabhacharya regards the world as a part of God's being aspect. Ramanuja regards it not as a part but as an attribute of God.

8. Both believe that the souls are many, and that they are knowers, doers and enjoyers.

9. The relation of the soul to God, according to Vallabhacharya is that of a part to the whole and according to Ramanuja that of the body to the soul; or to use the language of grammar, it is an adjective to the noun (soul) qualifing it.

10. Vallabhacharya does not regard the world (Achit, non-being) and the souls (Chit, consciousness) as inseparable from God. They have their separate existence even though they are manifested from God. Ramanuja thinks them inseparable from God in a causal as well as in an effect state.

11. Vallabhacharya accepts devotion alone and that too only the love-type of devotion as a means for God-realisation. Ramanuja accepts work and knowledge or worship. His idea of devotion is implicit in worship.

12. For knowledge of Brahman, Vallabhacharya accepts only the Verbal Testimony, in the form of the scriptures, which are four: the *Vedas*, the *Gita*, the *Brahma Sutras*, and the *Bhagawata*. Other sacred writings like the *Mimansa* and the Sutras are acceptable, if they agree with the above four works. Ramanuja accepts only the Vedas, the Gita and the Brahma Sutras. Perception and Inference are also accepted by him.

13. Vallabhacharya holds that matter, (being) and the soul (consciousness), become God-like when bliss is manifested in them. Ramanuja does not accept this view. To him Jada and Chit, remain essentially the same, unaltered in a causal state or an effect state.

14. Both accept that Brahman is a substratum of opposite qualities, which are divine.

15. Vallabhacharya holds that God reveals Himself as the world and the souls, unaffected by modifications. Ramanuja holds that God's body i.e. 'being and consciousness' undergoes transformation and not God.

16. Vallabhacharya discriminates between the world and the Samsara. The world is real, but the Samsara is unreal. Ramanuja does not discriminate between them.

17. Vallabhacharya accepts *Anyathakhyati* in the state of ignorance and *Akhyati* in the state of perfect knowledge as explanations of wrong knowledge. Ramanuja resorts to only *Sat Khyati.*

18. Vallabhacharya divides souls into three categories: (1) *Pushti*-divine (2) *Maryada*-spiritual and (3) *Pravahi*-worldly. Ramanuja also has three divisions: (1) the eternal, (2) the released souls and (3) the bound.

19. Vallabhacharya's *Bhakti* in the highest sense is selfless love of God which has its origin in love (*Prema*), augmentation in attachment, (*Asakti*) and culmination *Vyasana* perfect detachment from the world, and experiencing God's love and enduring agonies due to separation from God. His devotion in the starting point is a 'means', but in its last state, develops into an end. Ramanuja, no doubt, accepts devotion as a means but that of nine-fold nature and it is not recognised as a separate means, but is subsumed under worship. He accepts devotion on two levels. On the ordinary level, it is a blend of surrender and worship, but on a higher level, it is pure knowledge or immediate intuitive knowledge of God, which is to be had by God's grace.

20. Both believe in God's grace as a cause of liberation.

21. Both believe that in liberation, the liberated soul does not become identical with Brahman but only similar to Brahman. Vallabhacharya adds that in liberation the soul is blessed by God

by His grace to participate in bliss of God.

22. Both consider *Purshottama* higher than *Akshara* but God's form as love is appreciated only by Vallabhacharya. God not as Knowledge, but as Love, is to be experienced and enjoyed by the devotees. The enjoyment of God's love is the supreme bliss or liberation, according to him.

Bhaskara and Nimbarka

Bhaskracharya preached Bhedabheda Vada or Dvaita-advaita Difference and identity. There are three forms of this (1) Difference due to the will of God are to be ignored as differences. In fact there is non-difference. (2) Differences due to Upadhi. They are unreal. (3) Differences are real and non difference unreal. Vallabhacharya does not object to the first. The second forms the chief feature of Bhaskara's philosophy and the third of Nimbarka. Bhaskaracharya was supposed to be first Acharya, who opposed 'Shamkaracharya's Theory of *Maya* or Illusion. Vallabhacharya agrees with him in that respect, but he is a staunch advocate of pure non-dualism. Nimbarka accepts, in general, Bhaskara's view of Dvaitadvaita, but differs from him, in believing non-dualism as unreal. There is no point of agreement between Vallabhacharya and Nimbarka because Non-dualism is not accepted by him as real. Both however accept devotion. Bhaskara holds the theory of Dualism and Non-dualism, but rejects Dualism as unreal. Vallabhac harya may be inclined to support him. To a man in the middling position of knowledge, it may be alright, but to one, in a higher stage, there is no Dualism, but pure Non-Dualism, without any connection with *Maya* (illusion). According to him, even the so-called differences are expressive of God's reality.

Madhvacharya

We shall now compare Vallabhacharya with Madhvacharya. who was born in 1197 A.D. He is a champion of unqualified dualism. Vallabhacharya differs from him as below:

(1) Vallabhacharya taught pure non-dualism; Madhvacharya dualism.

(2) Vallabhacharya accepts only Verbal Testimony of the four holy scriptures for the knowledge of God. Madhvacharya accepts Verbal Testimony, perception and inference.

(3) Vallabhacharya regards Brahman alone as knowable. Madhavacharya adds the souls and the world also.

(4) To Vallabhacharya, the world and the souls are non different from Brahman, to Madhvacharya they are different.

(5) Vallabhacharya accepts God as Personal and Imper sonal, Madhvacharya as Personal only.

(6) Vallabhacharya believes that Brahman is a substratum of opposite qualities, Madhvacharya does not subscribe to this view.

(7) According to Vallabhacharya Brahman is both a material and efficient cause; according to Madhvacharya It is an efficient cause and Prakriti a material cause.

(8) Vallabhacharya holds that *Akshara* is the spiritual form of God, Machvacharya does not hold this view.

(9) Both accept that the souls are many and knowers.

(10) Vallabhacharya believes that in the state of liberation when bliss manifests in the soul, it will be pervasive like God; Madhvacharya does not share this view. According to him, the soul is even atomic in the released state.

(11) Both agree that the souls are agents of actions and enjoyers of the fruits of their deeds.

(12) Vallabhacharya believes that the soul-form is manifested from God by His will. Madhvacharya does not believe this.

(13) Vallabhacharya discriminates the world from *Samsara*; Madhvacharya does not discriminate between them.

(14) Vallabhacharya differentiates devotion from worship, Madhvacharya does not differentiate them.

(15) Vallabhacharya resorts to *Anyatha Khyati* in the state of ignorance and *khyati* in perfect state of knowledge; Madhvacharya resorts to *Anyatha Khyati* alone.

Vallabhacharya and Chaitanya Mahaprabhu

Chaitanya was one of the Acharyas of Vaishnavism, a contemporary of Vallabhacharya. Historically, his Vaisnavism is associated with the Madhva school. Due to some differences with the Madva school, his philosophical school is regarded as an independent one. Chaitanya himself did not write any book. He was a more mystic than a philosopher; but his disciples-

Rupa Goswami and Jiva Goswamy have written works on the nature of Bhakti element in that school. Baldeva Vidyabhushana also wrote a commentary called *Govinda Bhashyam* on the Brahma Sutras, propounding *Achintya bhedabheda Vada,* which means that God by His nature is unthinkable and indescribable.

Points of agreement and difference between Vallabhacharya and the Chaitanya school:-

(1) Both were the great Acharyas of the Devotional school of Vaishnavasim.

(2) Both regard Krishna as Supreme Brahman.

(3) Both classify Bhakti into two kinds (1) Devotion as a means and (2) Love type. Vallabhacharya names the first as the *Maryada* Bhakti and the second as *Pushti.*

(4) Vallabhacharya considers the love of the Gopis as highest Chaitanya that of Radha as highest.

(5) Vallabhacharya's philosophy is known as Pure Non-dualism, Chaitanya's, as unthinkable Identity-in-Difference.

(6) Vallabhacharya explains away the apparent contradictions in the nature of Brahman by attributing them to God's will, but Chaitanya explains them by the concept of unthinkability of God's nature.

(7) Vallabhacharya considers 'being' and 'consciousness' as constituting the parts of God's nature and Bliss as the essence of God. The Chaitanya school considers them as the powers of God inherent in Him. Besides these unthinkable powers, God has external powers called *Maya Shakti,* and *Jiva Shakti.* God's form is qualified and all His powers are His qualifications.

(8) Both agree that the souls are many and that they emanate from God like the rays from the sun.

(9) Both think the world, real.

(10) To both, liberation is the state in which the soul enjoys eternal love of Krishna.

(11) The Vallabhacharyan School no doubt, teaches the mode of reciting God's praises, as a means of experiencing His Love like Chaitanya, but it is only during the state of *Nirodha.* In the state of suffering pangs of separation from God, even that is discarded as a hindrance. The Chaitanya school lays stress upon it as a means of experiencing love for God.

Vallabhacharya and Shri Kantha

Shri Kantha follows qualified non-dualism of Ramanuja but he makes Shiva an ultimate principle. Vallabhacharya advocates pure non-dualism and regards Krishna as ultimate principle of supreme God. Shri Kantha holds Shiva as the cause of the creation, maintenance and destruction of the world; Vallabhacharya holds Brahman as the cause. According to Shri Kantha, God Shiva's body is a celestial non-material. According to Vallabhacharya, it is of Bliss or Love. Both hold that God is the material and efficient cause of the universe. The universe, according to both is the result of transformation of the supreme God, which is not a change or illusion. Again both agree that Brahman and the universe are non-different, but not identical. Shri Kantha does not maintain absolute difference between Brahman and the world as between a jar and a piece of cloth, nor their absolute non difference, nor the illusiveness of the world, nor difference and non difference, between them. He maintains the non-dualism of the distinct kind, as existing between body and the embodied, or between a quality and the qualified. Thus, he lends suppor to Ramanuja's, qualified non-dualism, which is different from pure non-dualism of Vallabhacharya. Shri Kantha preached Shaivism while Vallabhacharya preached the Krishna cult of Vaishnavism. Salvation according to Shri Kantha is the State of the soul's perfect resamblance with God (sarupya) by the acquisition of God's qualities like omniscience, independence etc. except the creative power of God. Vallabhacharya's idea of liberation is somewhat similar, but he describes it as *Sayujya*—the state in which the soul's pesonality, is retained, so that having become God-like, it can participate in God's bliss.

Vallabhacharya and Shripati

Shripati advocates 'The unity in difference' theory in relation to the qualified dualism. His supreme God is Shiva. His theory differs from the *Parinamavada* of Ramanuja as well as the *Vivartavada* of Shamkara. His view combines both the unity and difference of the soul with God, or from God, on the analogy of the serpent and its coils or the sun and its rays.

Vallabhacharya reconciles the conflict by interpreting it as dualism, in conformity with non-dualism. The serpent in its coils is the same serpent or the rays of the sun, though they seem to be different, are the same. Vallabhacharya says, just as the rays belong to the sun and, therefore, are not different from it, as possessing light, so the souls, though they appear as different are not different from God; because they possess in them the light of consciousness of God. They are parts of God's consciousness. They are one with God. Shri Pati like Shri Kantha regards Shiva as Supreme God. Vallabhacharya's supreme God is Krishna. Both maintain that God is the material and the efficient cause of the world, and both criticise the Maya principle of Shamkara, and both think the world to be real. Both agree that God is both immanent and transcendental. Shri Pati believes that the soul in the state of bondage is different from God, but in liberation it is not different. Vallabha holds that even in the state of bondage, the soul is not different from God. It is His part of consciousness, though it forgets its relation with God. Shri Pati is a a Shivite Acharya, Vallabha a Vaishnavite of the Bhagvata School. To the former, Shiva is supreme God, to the latter Krishna. In philosophical matters such as the *Maya* theory, reality of the world and God's being the material and effiicient cause, they agree.

Vallabhacharya and Vignanabhikshu

Vignanbhiskshu, who lived in the 17th century clarifies his philosophical thoughts in his commentary on the Brahma Sutras called '*Vignanamrita*'. The Special feature of his commentary is that, it is an attempt to reconcile the Vedanta and the Samkhya systems. He disagrees with Shamkara in his concept of Brahman. According to him, there are two forms of Brahman-the Absolute and the personal. *Prakriti* and *Purusha* exist outside God and coexist with Him. Although the world is not real, it has reality for the purpose of the *Vyavaharika* existence. It is Ishvara who is responsible for the creation of the world. Prakrati (matter) is associated with Purusha (soul) due to the operation of God, otherwise no association between them is possible.

Vallabhacharya does not distinguish between Brahman and the *Ishvara*. They are one. The association of the *Prakriti* with *Purusha* is due to God's will. *Prakriti* or being and *Purusha* (soul) are the parts of God. They are manifestations of God. The world has neither empirical, nor temporal, but permanent reality. Vallabhacharya does not think *Prakrati* as the *Upadhi* of Brahman. To Vignanbhikshu, *Ishwara* is not the ultimate principle. He is the manifstation of pure consciousness in Sattvamaya body.

Vallabhcharya regards Him as ultimate principle and He is not the manifestation in the Sattvamaya body.

Both agree in holding the souls as parts and that they are derived from God, like sparks from fire. Vallabhacharya names Krishna as supreme God but Vagnanbhikshu says that Krishna is a part of God as the son is a part of his father. According to him, salvation means the soul's entry in Brahman. It is the state of non-difference with God. Both accept the Sayujya and not oneness with Brahman as soul's goal. It is the enjoyment of Bliss with God by living in proximity with Him. Both admit Bhakti or love as a means for God-realisation. However, Vignanabhikshu says that for the knowledge of Brahman, the knowledge of the *Samkhya* system is necessary. Without that knowledge, one cannot understand the association of *Prakrati* with *Purusha.* Vignanabhikshu may be regarded as a theistic *Samkhya.* He supplies the missing link of God of the *Samkhya* system, which transcends consciousness and matter, but joins hands with them and Shamkara by differentiating God from the Absolute Brahman. It is strange that with His vedantic inclination, he gives importance to the Bhakti of the love-type as a means for God-realisation. His doctrine is rather a hotchpotch of the Vedanta, the Samkhya and the Bhakti school. Vallabhacharya is faithful to his philosophy of Pure Non-dualism of Brahman which is consistent with the doctrine of the Bhakti.

Shri Arvinda

We shall now compare Arvinda with Vallabhacharya, though according to the orthodox belief, he is not considered as an Acharya. However, he deserves a place in the work, as a highly distinguished and world-famous philosopher of India of the modern times. His works on the 'Life Divine', the 'Essays on the Gita' and commentaries on the Upanishadas testify to the fact that he is also a philosopher taking rank with the Acharyas who flourished in the past. His philosophy has no particular label, still it has certain distinctive marks. He has shown by his philosophical thoughts, the practical way of yoga for God-realisation. We shall note below some points of comparison with Vallabhacharya.

1. Both are the exponents of the philosophy of Non-dualism.

2. Both explain Brahman in two aspects (1) Personal and (2) Impersonal. Vallabhacharya knows them as *Purushottama* and *Akshara*, Arvinda as Super Mind and Over-mind.

3. Vallabhacharya accepts Being, Consciousness and Bliss as the attributes of God, as constituting His essence and the first two as His parts; Arvinda identifies Sat with Atman, Ishvara and Purusha and consciousness as force of God.

4. Both agree in holding that bliss of God underlies all manifestations of God.

5. Both accept the concept of incarnation of God.

6. Vallabhacharya accepts Krishna as the Suprme God, the Perfect Incarnation of God; Arvinda accepts Him, no doubt, as incarnation of God but not as Perfect God.

7. The way of realising God according to Vallabhacharya is devotion of the love-type, that of Arvinda is Integral *Yoga*.

8. To Vallabhacharya, devotion is an independent means, to Arvinda it is included under Yoga discipline which aims at the manifestation of Supermind in the soul. The aim of Vallabhacharya's devotion is the participation in the bliss of God in the state of Union with Him.

9. Both agree that the actions should be regarded as divine and they should be performed with reference to God.

10. Vallabhacharya recommends *Nirodha* as the way of enjoying love for God. Shri Arvinda recommends *Yoga* as the way of the ascent of the soul to God, and God's manifestation in it.

11. Sri Arvinda interprets Karma (action) as a sacrifice and not merely the Vedic Karma, Vallabhacharya accepts the Vedic Karma as a sacrifice but in its highest form, he identifies it with the Divine service of God.

12. The doctrines of affinity with God, dedication and surrender are acceptable to both.

13. Vallabhacharya admonishes one to transcend the world, by non attachment to it, and focussing the mind and senses on

God. The same is taught by Arvinda in a different form, namely, that one should rise above the physical plane and reach the supramental state.

14. Vallabhacharya regards knowledge as a constituent of Brahman. It is also said to be the power of God. Its aim is the comprehension of the nature of God and help the seekers of God in the realisation of God.

Shri Arvinda makes knowledge identical with Brahman. It is not only a mental process but a matter of the whole being. Its ultimate aim is to know the Divine being, who is transcendental and inherent in the cosmos and within the individual, so that through integral Yoga, the seeker of Supermind experinecces manifestation in him. According to Vallabhacharya, the knowledge of *Brahman* is sought through the scriptures alone, only by *Sattvika* Intellect which will make one realise oneness of God even in the midst of apparent multiplicity.

15. To Vallabhacharya, knowledge, known as *Vidya* is a power of God by which a devotee experiences love for God and finally participates in His bliss. Disgust for the world (*Vairagya*), knowledge of God's nature, fixing of mind on God, undergoing pangs of separation and supreme love are the five forms of knowledge. The opposite of knowledge is ignorance. It is also God's power. It is five fold (1) forgetfulness of its nature by the soul that it is related to God as His part (2) mistaking the body for soul (3) mistaking senses for the soul (4) mistaking vital breath for the soul (5) mistaking the mind or internal organs for the soul.

Arvinda considers knowledge and ignorance as the powers of the consciousness of the Absolute, which are four:— (1) the superconscient silence (2) the supermental concentration (3) overmental awareness (4) Inconscience-characteristic nature of ignorance.

(16) Ignorance is nothing but limitation of knowledge without which evolution is impossible. Shri Arvinda believes that an existence without ignorance shall be a static existence, though divine and perfect. It is separative knowledge forgetful of the unity underlying the Many. According to him the locus of ignorance is neither self nor God, but Nature. According to Vallabhacharya ultimately its locus is God but attributed to God's will for the

purpose of His *lila*. Shri Arvinda accepts seven kinds of ignorances, which he names as the original, the cosmic, the egoistic, the temporal, the Psychological, the constitutional and the practical ignorance.

Both Vallabhacharya and Arvinda recognise the necessity of ignorance in the divine scheme. Both see that, there is a purpose behind it; and both maintain that ignorance must be removed by knowledge for experiencing God.

17. Both hold that the fundamental purpose of God in creating the world is His *lila*. To both the world is the *lila* of God.

18. Both accept that the universe is a self concealment of *Sachidanand*.

19. Shri Arvinda uses the word 'evolution' for spiritual progress of the self. Vallabhacharya does not use that word, but expresses the sense of development of the soul through the various phases of devotion, ultimately culminating in the soul's participation in the bliss of God.

Dr. Radhakrishnan, a living world-renowned philosopher of the contemporary age, agreeing with Ramanuja holds that there is no difference between the Absolute and God and that the *Maya* or illusion theory is erroneous. This is also the view of Vallabhacharya.

CHAPTER V

SHRI VALLABHACHARYA IN THE LIGHT OF THE WESTERN PHILOSOPHY

It might seem, then that only God left to religion is the Deus Siva of Spinoza, the One Being of whom all men and all things are modifications.But we must not identify all these modifications as different with God, rather they are all identical with God, in so far as they are identical with one another."

J. C. Wordsworth, in '*Adventures in Philosophy*', p. 320

Really the problem of the many and the one, is the problem of problems and the main function is to avoid abstractions of monism and pluralism in their extreme forms and to offer an intelligible universe which is one in many and many in One, which is neither the realm of pure particulars. nor the realm of the pure universals, but one of concerete universals in which particulars do not kill the universal but makes the absolute spirit, a living Reality where particulars are the concrescence of the universal.

Prof. A. M Bhattacharya, in *Principles of Philosophy*' I. *424*.

In this section, a brief attempt is made to distinguish some important ideas of Vallabhacharya's philosophy from those of some prominent philosphers of the West. It should, however, be noted here that, the aims of Indian philosophy and those of the Western Philosophy are not identical. In the West, it is an intellectual attempt to deal with the nature of Reality, a sort of intellectual dynamism, but in India it is a means of spiritual salvation. It is not knowledge for its own sake, but for freeing life from worldly bondage and making it eternally happy. The Western Philosophy is independent of Religion but the Indian Philosophy has religious backgound. Its main concern is with the knowledge about ultimate Reality which is not only Being but Consciousness and Bliss. Its aim is to enable aspirants of spiritual life to achieve the goal of liberation or union with God. As Shri Arvinda says, 'It should be a discovery of the Reality of things, by which human existence can learn its law, aim, and principle of its perfection. So it is, both theoretical and practical. As theoretical, it gives knowledge of the Reality but, as practical, it shows the means for approaching Reality. The Western Philosophy is only Theoretical. Religion is considered as the practical philosophy in India. Philosophy as theoretical knowledge, provides knowledge by which a man knows the nature of Supreme Reality and his relation to It, and by practical philosophy, as accepted by the Orthodox system in India, he is first to comprehend God and then endeavour to achieve unity with Him. Vallabhacharya's philosophical view is Indian and strictly Vedic in relation to God. According to him, it is intended for God—realisation and the union of the soul with God, because he believes that the soul of a man in this world originally belongs to God, but by His will it is separated from Him, and has come down to this world. The aim of philosophy is to make the soul aware of its natural relationship with God, and by means of this knowledge to achieve unity with Him; so that, he may be free from worldly bondage. This aim of philosophy must be kept in mind while comparing Vallabhacharya's philosophical thought with that of the Western philosophers.

We shall take only important ideas and compare them with those of the prominent philosophers from the West.

1. *Knowledge :* There are various theories about knowledge in the Western Philosophy, such as Empirical, Rational, Critical and Intuitional. Locke and Berkely were empirieists. They regarded sensations and feelings as the source of knowledge. The Rationalist school of Leibniz challanged empiricism and established the claim of reason as a source of knowledge. Kant criticised and found it defective as an explanation of the noumenal, though it was admitted for the purpose of the phenomenal. Reason may satisfy our curiosity of knowledge in the matter of the things circumscribed by space and Time, but not so, in the case of a transcendental substance. Bergson advocated the Intuition theory. He believed that intellect being static, fails to understand the Reality, which is dynamic. To him, intuition is the only organ of grasping Reality. Intellect cuts the Reality into bits. It is intuition which comprehends Reality as a whole.

Vallabhacharya trusts only the Verbal Testimony i.e. the holy scriptures as a source of knowledge of Reality. He rejects Perception, Inference, Word Testimony, Analogy, Implication and Negation. The aim of knowledge is to know God as one without differences. All the objects, with names and forms are God's own manifestations. Each one of them reveals God's particular attribute or power.

Through knowledge, one has to understand this, and endeavour to reach Reality. The aim of knowledge, according to Vallabhacharya is to grasp Reality first and then realise Him, by means of the knowledge of the scriptures and the devopment of the Satvika Intellect. This knowledge is not theoretical but it must enable the aspirant to reach God through practical forms of knowledge (*Vidya*) Viz. Disgust for the world, the knowledge of non-dualism of God, concentration of mind on God, suffering ills of life and love for God. All these five forms represent the practical side of knowledge. Theoretical knowledge has no value, if it cannot make life better spiritually and divine, and release soul from worldly bondage and unite it permanently with God. In this respect, the Western Philosophy has no parallel with Vallabhacharya's view of knowledge.

Truth and Error : Regarding Truth, there are three theories in the Western Philosophy—the Correspondence theory, the Coherence or Inherence theory and the Pragmatism theory. The Correspondence theory of truth is the theory of the Realistic school. It maintains the correspondence between the ideas and facts. It admits partial truth and not the whole truth. The Coherence theory values truth for its Inherent value, irrespective of its consequences. Non-violence is inherently true even though one has to lose one's own life in pursuit of it. The Pragmatic truth sees its value in its utility in external gains. If it can serve one's purpose, it is considered true for the achievement of the object, though it may not be permanently true. For a greater right, it will even allow a little wrong. A particular social act may be a piece of injustice to others, but if it proves effective in the solution of a particular problem or difficulty, it is to be accepted as truth. If one who tells a lie to save a cow from being killed by a band of butchers, the pragmatists will not consider it as opposed to truth. To the coherents, it is untruth. The coherent truth is idealistic truth and the pragmatic, practical or materialistic. Between the two, is the truth of correspondence. Kant advocated coherent truth and James Pragmatic truth. Truth of Shamkara is coherent, that of Ramanuja, correspondent. Vallabhacharya's theory of truth is a combination of all these theories. Truth, being *Brahman,* is true in all its aspects, inherently as well as outwardly. It has both empirical existence for practical purpose and the real existence also.

The jars etc, which are inherently God's 'being', are also true, although they have distinct names and forms. They are expressions of God's Reality. Not only this, but what is called an error is also a fact or truth. When we mistake a rope for a snake, it is not wrong knowledge. The facts of there being a snake and a rope are not contradicted. Only they are prceived in a different context. Due to the impact of Tamas attribute of the intellect, the rope is not perceived; but it is due to the real snake with which it resembles and whose idea is retained as an image in the memory of one who perceives. In fact, there is no wrong knowledge, for everything is *Brahman*, even in things not revealed. Shamkara ascribes error or wrong knowledge to *Maya* (illusion) or ignorance. Vallabhacharya ascribes it to the Will of God and as such there is no error.

God: The idea of God is accepted but has different shades of meaning with different philosophers or systems of Philosophy.

Plato, a strong advocate of the theory of Ideas, believes in God, but thinks of God, as the creator and governor of the universe. Aristotle calls God as the Prime Mover, who Himself is static, and not dynamic. He is the perfect wisdom and eternaal cause of the beauty and order of the universe. Descartes accepts God as underlying all forms of matter and mind. He believes that God gives an original push and matter and mind originate. All the world and every body is a machine, but God is outside the world and within the body, is the spiritual soul. He accepts the transcendence of God only. He establishes the existence of God by arguing that because the idea of God exists in me, God must exist. God is archetype of our existence. He has created man in his own image. He is the creator of all things and is eternal, ominiscient, omnipotent and the source of all goodness and truth. He succeeds Spinoza who conceives God as immanent in the world. His theory is that 'All is God and God is all.' The matter and mind are expressions of God. God is in the universe and not outside it. He is single, eternal, inflinite self, causal and the immanent principle of the universe. In other words, according to him, God is in the world and the world is in Him. He is the source of everything. God is both cause and effect. God and the world are not separate entities. He is a substratum or essence of all things. His idea of God is pantheistic, because to him the world or nature, taken as a whole, is God. Leibniz who is an exponent of the theory of monads, regards God as the supreme Monad to whom is attirbuted the pre-established harmony in the world. Kant believes in Transcendental and Absolute God and proves God's existence on moral grounds. God is a Thing-in-Itself. He is not a creator of the world. Spinoza's God is Immanent, identified with Nature or Universe, but Kant's God is Absolute, the only transcendental Reality, without immanence or any relation with the world and the souls. But Hegel reconciles the views of all his predecessors, by accepting God as both, transcendental and immanent. Instead of pantheistic conception of God, he holds panentheism, which means belief in 'All is in God' differing from Spinoza who expressed it as 'All is God.' He maintains that God as a dynamic reality, realises His own nature by differentiating Himself into the world of things and minds with its attributes and relations. God's reality is not all exhausted in the world. It is only a small fraction of that Reality which is manifested in the universe, and the rest is unmanifested as Transcendental. This view of Hegel, to some extent, corresponds with that of Vallabhacharya and Ramnuja who regard God, in both the capacities. Vallabhacharya believes the world and the souls as manifestation of God's constituents-Being and Consciousness respectively. The world and the souls have been separated from God by His Will. The separated parts—the world and the embodied souls, are in their outer forms expressive of God's reality. They are also as real as God. Although, God is above the world, He is also in the world. There is not a single object in the world which does not reveal God. God as a cause does not exist apart from an effect. The effect, though separate, is one with God. Hegel's theory of God is very much approximate to the non-dualistic theory which discovers an organic unity of differences, a totality of parts, a unified and yet differentiated whole. He believes God as a substratum of oppositions and contradictions. This is similar to Vallabhacharya's theory of *Viruddhadharmasryatva* of God (Theory of God's being a substratum of opposite qualities). He does not split up Reality into essence and appearance or substance and attributes; but considers the Reality as a whole. Like Vallabhacharya, he believes that Art, Religion and Philosophy, serve as useful means for the realisation of God. His conception of God is, however, Abstract as an Idea, Vallabhacharya's is concrete one possessed of personality. Again Hegel's approach to God is through intellect, but Vallabhacharya's through love. His theory of Dialectical Movement of a change from Theistic and Antitheistic stages to Synthetic stage, has no parallel in Vallabha's philosophy.

Next to Hegel, Bradley enjoys reputation of being an eminent philosopher in the West. He believes God as Absolute, a suprapersonal, spiritual principle which transcends all contradiction and relation, of which the concept of personality is constituted. He differs from Hegel in holding that the proper organ for comprehending God is not intellect but the whole of mental life, inclusive of will and feelings. He thus accepts, in terms of the Hindu Philosophy, value of work, knowledge and devotion. To him, God as Absolute is real; but the world is unreal—an appearance only. This corresponds to Shamkara's concept of Mayavada. Shamkara, however, recognises knowledge alone as a means. Bradley's concept of God is totally opposed to that of Vallabhacharya. According to him God is personal and not Absolute; and is to be reached by devotion alone. He does not regard, like Bradley, the world as unreal. Bonsanquet follows almost the same line of thought as Bradley; but he gives utmost importance to the intellect for grasping Reality.

Bergson denominates God as Elan Vital. He identified God with life. God is persistently creative but He is finite, limited by matter. He is neither omniscient, nor omnipresent. Vallabhacharya's God is infinite, creator, omnipotent and omniscient. This God, who is creative, is always creating new forms and never stops in His creative activity. Vallabhacharya's God does not always create. He creates when He wills to do it. He withdraws the world after creating it, when He does not want the world to exist. Bergson terms the change of mind and matter (souls and the world) from God as evolution. Vallabhacharya understands it as a process of manifestation and non-manifestation. William James, an American psychologist and philosopher was a Pluralist. He criticises monism and supports pluralism. He is pragmatist. He accepts God, as helper of men, in their daily struggle of life. To him monism is the natural disease of philosophers. He believes in free Will of the individuals, and not in the Will of God. There is nothing common with him in Vallabha's philosophy.

The position of God in the Western philosophy is as indicated above. Just as the concept of God in Indian philosophy has undergone modification from the time of Shamkara onwards, so it has undergone modification, in the western philosophy too. Descartes thinks of God, as existing outside the world, Spinoza as existing wholly in the world, Leibniz as one of the Mondas, Kant as Absolute-Transcendental, Hegel as Transcendental and Immanent, Bradley only as Absolute and Bergson as creative and also as manifested in the world. All these views tend to lend support to Monism, but with James and Ward it takes a turn to pluralism.

According to Vallabhacharya, God is an ultimate Reality. He is omnipotent, omnipresent and omniscient. He is the material and efficient cause of the world. He is related to the world and the souls as the whole is to its parts. The whole in the parts is inseparable and therefore, parts are not different from the whole. God by His Will for His Lila has manifested diversity of objects from Him. These diversities are only outer expressions of God. They are not an appearance or modification, but constitute God's essence. Each object is separative only formally but in essence it is God under different forms. Vallabha's God is Non-Dual. He creates the world for His own Lila. The Western philosophers advance theories such as cosmological, teleological, ontological, and moral to prove the existence of God. Vallabhacharya believes that there is no need of proof for proving God's existence as He is self existent, according to the *Upanishads*. All these philosophers accept God as ultimate truth though they may differ about the nature of God; but not about the existence of God. The Naiyayikas, have attempted to prove God. But the author of the Brahma Sutras, instead of attempting to prove the existence of God, accepts the existence and causality of God as self-evident. The purpose of God's creation is said to be His *lila.* Vallabhacharya sees no point in hazarding any arguments for proving the existence of God. God is Self-existent and self-luminous, and being incomprehensible is beyond the reach of the senses. It cannot be circumscribed within Time-Space limit and so cannot be grasped by any logical method. A seeker of God, must accept the existence of God by faith in the scriptures for his quest of God. Vallabhacharya only explains the nature of God and indicates the way for the quest of God.

The World : The Western Philosophers have evinced absorbing interest in the problem of the world. They have arrived at different conclusions about the origin of the world. The materialists accept matter, as the cause from which the world has come out. The early Greeks considered one of the five elements or all the elements combined as the source of the world. Thales regarded water, Anaximander and Anaximenes air, and Empedocles four elements viz. earth, water, fire and air in combitaion. He was succeeded by Democritics and Leucippus, reducing everying to atoms. Thus all those philosophers thought matter as the final source of the World. But there was one great drawback in this theory. How can lifeless and static atoms combine themselves into various things and their shapes. The Vaisheshikas of India made atoms the cause of the world, but they had to recognise God as an efficient cause to combine and regulate the atoms and mould them into various shapes. The Greek atomists did not recognise efficient cause. How can, then, these atoms themselves be combined without one to combine them? It requires some intelligent principle to put them together and arrange them in an orderly way. Left to themselves, the atoms are capricious. The atomic theory cannot explain the origin of life in the world, without some life principle along with matter. Plato considered this point and solved it by supposing an animating soul beside the four elements and the world soul, though according to him, all things are the copies of a permanent idea. He believes that Demiurge fashions the world, after the pattern of the ideal world, like a human artist. Demiurge is not really a creator, but an Architect only. His function is to impose the forms on a persistent material. The world soul imparts motion and is pervasive. Ultimately, according to Plato, Demiurge or God is the active and dynamic cause of the world. Plato introduced world soul and God in the Western philosophy for the first time though he considers matter as a flux. Aristotle regards matter as the real stuff of the world of objects. Matter and form combined give shape to concerte things of the universe. According to him, form is identical with God who is Himself a Prime Mover, but Himself remains unmoved. God is not a creator but only a mover of the world. He is the final cause, the drive and purpose of things that form the world, the principle of its life, the sum of its vital process and powers the inherent goal of its growth, the energizing entelechy of the whole, having its purpose within. He is identified with Activity or Mystic force. He is not a person but a magnetic power. He is free from will to create as He is absolutely perfect. Artistotle attributes life principle to God, but this God is only a Power of Activity and not one possessed of Power. So it is also defective as a theory of the world. Power itself is an abstract thing, unless it is moved or exercised by any agent possessed of power. How can it function without an agent? Electricity possesses power of giving light, but without the agent to bring it out, how can it, of its own accord, discharge light? It has to be moved by a mover or an agent. Artitole's God is not a mover. Vallabhacharya's God is mover also. He is both a material and efficient cause. He can assume any form He likes by His own will. Aristotle's God has no Will. He is not an intelligent God who has will. He is devoid of intelligence, so He cannot bring out the world. Without an original mover, there cannot be movement and the concept of a mover presupposes the existence of a mover who is personal. Aristotle's theory in this respect falls short of a logical reasoning. However, he must be given credit for having improved Plato's idea of God and for making Him identical with force or power, which was necessary for accounting life in the world. Descartes, thinks of the world as composed of matter and mind-the essence of one being extension, and that of the other consciousness. These two are of opposite natures; but he says that, God introduced motion into the matter and the various things of the world became manifest. He conceived one substance underlying all forms of matter and mind. He thought that the original push to the world was given by God. He believed God as existing outside the world and the soul in the body. His theory is that, there is one absolute substance, God and two relative substances, mind and body which exist independently of one another; but both depend on God. This approximates to Vallabha's theory that 'being' (Sat, existence, matter) and 'consciousness' are independent of each other and dependent on God. Again Descartes is not correct in supposing God existing outside the world. According to Vallabhacharya the matter and souls 'being' and 'consciousness' are themsleves integral constituents of God. They existed in God, prior to their manifestation, in the form of the world and the souls, so, in their manifested forms, they are expressions of God. Vallabha would say if the world has come out of God by His own Will, how can it be without the revelation of God? The world, being organically an essence of God, cannot be without Him in its manifested form. Descartes forgets this important point. It was left to Spinoza to improve the glaring flaw in Descartes' theory of two substances—absolute and relative, by supposing God as existing in the world only. To him, matter and souls are not separate, but as constituents of one Principle-Substance i.e. God, identified by him, with Nature. He said that all things in the whole universe are expressions of God, manifesting the specific attributes of God, who does not exist outside the world but in the totality of the things of the world. Vallabhacharya's God besides being immanent is transcendental also. Again Vallabhacharya's God is Personal. Spinoza does not consider God as a cause and the world as its effect. The relation between the two is that of the ground and the consequent. He holds that every thing, every event, every mind and every mental function—all are God and nothing else. God's Reality is an abstract unity destitute of all contents and is static, unmoved and unmoving. This God cannot become an object of comprehension or experience. Such a God is not fit for practical purposes. His God is immanent. According to Vallabha, this concept is also defective and represents only one side of a coin. God is both Absolute and concrete, transcendental-above the world and also Immanent-existing in the world. Locke reduced the worldly objects to ideas and Berkeley to mind and established unreality of matter, but Kant who was a rationalist differentiated the noumenal from the phenomenal; Mind and Matter are phenomenal and subject to changes and so they are not real. They are cognised only by sense-experience and reason. They have no permanence. God who is above them all is changeless-a Thing-by-Itself. He asserted the absoluteness of God and unreality of the world. His theory of the world corresponds to that of Shamkarcharya. Hegal being not satisfied with

Kant's view, improved it by affirming that matter and mind (souls) are manifestations of God. In this respect, his view corresponds to that of Ramanujacharya and Vallabhacharya, to whom the world is God's manifestation. Hegel conceived God as transcendental and immanent in the world. It is a great advance in the conception of God; but this God is Absolute and cannot become an object of experience like the God of Ramanujacharya and Vallabhacharya. He reconciles the antithesis of the mind and matter, possessed of opposite qualitieis by his Dialectical Method. Vallabhacharya reconciles it by supposing God as a substratum of opposite qualities.

Bradley thought the world as an appearance only. Vallabhacharya differs from the Western philosophers in his conception of the world as under :—

1. Neither Nature nor elements or atoms are the cause of the world.

2. God who is 'Being', 'Consciousness' and 'Bliss' is the material cause as well as efficient cause of the universe.

3. The world represents the 'Being' constituent of the universe.

4. The world is not an appearance but a manifestation of God.

5. The world is revealed by God from Himself by His own Will.

6. The prupose of the creation of the world is God's Lila or play.

7. The world, being the essence of God, is real.

8. All the objects with different forms and names are God's attributes and as such they are also real.

9. The world is a part of God.

10. Before manifestation, the world was latent in God in a causal-state. In the effect-state it received a distinct form.

11. Becoming of the world is nothing but 'Being' of God.

12. The world is different from mundane existence. The former is the creation of God and the latter, that of a human soul due to ignorance and egoism. The former is real whereas the latter is unreal. The former is destroyed only by God's will, the latter by souls' acquisition of knowledge and devotion.

As the world is God's creation it should be loved and not shunned as an evil.

13. God is in the world as well as above the world.

The Self : The Indian Philosophy understands by this word, 'the soul', but the Western Philosophy identifies it with mind or consciousness. To the empiricists, mind and self stand undistinuished and both are dissipated into unconnected bits of mental reaction. Plato distinguishes between the self and the soul. According to him, the former means the aggregate of empirical states and processes; the latter means the noumenal reality which unifies the empirical states and processes. Descartes and Spinoza used the word "Mind". Descartes distinguishes it from mind, Spinoza does not demarcate between the two. Liebniz uses the term monad for a principle which is both mind and matter and believes in pluralism of monads. Kant recognises only one ultimate Reality, appearing as plural selves or minds. To Hegel it is a representation of the Absolute, which is tantamount to Monism. In the Indian Philosophy, the idea of the 'self' is viewed differently —the Samkhyas view it as Purusha residing in a body. The Naiyayikas and the Vaisheshikas believe in many souls, but they regard God as a Superior Soul. To Shamkaracharya soul is one, though it appears as many as embodied souls. Ramanuja considers it as an attribute of God i.e. consciousness and says that the soul is not one but many.

Vallabhacharya's soul has the following characteristics :

1. It is a consciousness-constituent of God.
2. It is small in size as much as hundredth part of the end of a hair.
3. It is a part of God.
4. It is both, knowledge and a knower, and also a doer and an enjoyer.
5. Souls are many, and not different from God.
6. The relation of the souls to God is that of the parts to the whole.
7. The soul has 'being' and 'consciousness' of God, but not His 'bliss'.
8. By knowledge and devotion, the souls achieve the state of similarty to God.

9. The souls possess consciousness of God, without God's six qualities—Disgust for the world, almightiness, omnipotence, omniscience, Glory and Beauty which are conealed by God in their worldly state.
10. The devotional souls, in their liberated state, are capable of participating in the bliss of God.

The Western Philosophy, does not distinguish the soul by these characteristics. It is simply consciousness and nothing more.

Evil : The theologians in the West think evil as punishment from God for men's sins. The psychologists think them as due to maladjustment with the environment. Among the philosophers, Spinoza and Hegal consider them as unreal and illusive. Shamkara attributed them to ignorance, but Vallabhacharya considers it as a part of the divine plan. It owes its origin to the Will of God. It is created by God for the fulfilment of a plan in His *Lila.* It is, therefore, not to be denounced but accepted cheerfully as God's blessing in disguise. It should be resisted by the force of devotion to God.

Value : The question of value has acquired utmost importance in the Western Philosophy. It is the end, towards which human efforts are directed. There have been various theories, each stressing a particular form as a value according to psychological or subjective conception of the value. To the majority, Pleasure is a real value. Everybody seeks some kind of pleasure. The Realistic school believes that, that which has universal acceptance is a value. To the pragmatist, anything useful in solving present problems is a value. Some consider wealth, some power, some morality, some knowledge and some union with God or realisation of God as a value. Most of the Indian philosophers have made liberation—freedom from worldly bondage and union with God as the supreme value. According to Shamkara, it is the merging of the individual self into the Supreme Reality through knowledge, and according to Ramanuja, sharing in God's Knowledge, Goodness and Beauty. Vallabhacharya regards Supreme God as the Highest Goal. The attachment to God and participation in His bliss through supreme love for God and His Grace is the Highest value, and asserts that all our efforts should be directed towards the attainment of this value. God should be the centre of all our desires, aims and aspirations. Our highest position in life is nothing, if we have not realised God. For the attainment of this highest value, we must discard all earthly things, loves and hates, attractions and repulsions, honours and dishonours. We should detach ourselves from the world and be attached to God. This does not mean that we should be indifferent to our duties in the world. We may do our duties, but consider them as duties from God and unto God. We should do all work, as work of God and for God. Our knowledge must be the knowledge of God and for the attainment of God. All our loves must be expressions of love for God. This means that, in all our experiences, in all our doings, we must feel that they are God-imposed, and for the attainment of God. In other words, while doing worldly duties, we should keep our mind Godwards. Living in the world, we should transcend the world and reach God, not only reach God, but participate in His bliss. In his embodied state the soul has consciousness of God, without His bliss. This bliss, which is latent in him, must be revealed and experienced by the love for God. This is the real value. All other values are only a means to this.

Vallabhacharya is a staunch believer in God. He is thoroughly religious. His philosophy serves as a means to religious life. It is not metaphysics. It enables one to comprehend Reality called God and also shows the way to reach or realise Him. The end of philosophy according to him, is not merely knowledge, but seeking God and ultimately participating in God's bliss in union with Him.

Comparative evaluation of Vallabhacharya's theory of Reality.

It is worth while here to indicate briefly the views of the Western philosophers to enable readers how far they help them in comparing them generally with the views of the Indian philosophers. It is usually accepted that the aim of all philosophy is the ascertainment of truth or understanding the nature of Reality. The Western philosophy understands 'Philosophy' in the sense of intellectual quest for truth, whereas the Indian philosophy understands it, as practical realisation of Truth or Reality. The method adopted by the Western philosophers for understanding Reality is that of knowledge acquired by senses, reason or intiution.

The Indian philosophers endeavoured to understand the Reality by means of proofs, such as Perception, Inference, Testimony, Analogy, Implication and Negation. The materialists like *Charvaka* accepted only the first, *Buddhists* the first-two, the Naiyayikas first-four and the Mimansa school all the six proofs. However, the later philosophers like Shamkaracharya, Ramanuja, Vallabhacharya, Madhvacharya, accepted only the Verbal Testimony and by that they understood the Scriptures only.

In the Western philosophy, there is no clear cut goal. It only acquaints one with the nature of Reality, but does not point to a specific goal to be achieved by knowing the Reality. The Western philosophy is well known for four different theories-Materialism, Idealism, Dualism, and Pluralism. The materialists are represented by the early Greek philosophers, namely, Thales, Anaximander, Anaximenes, Exmedocles, Democritus, and Leucippus. They were known as Atomists; they, in their investigation of the Reality came to the conclusion, that there is nothing real besides the world which is composed of the atoms. According to these materialists, all reality is corporeal, extended and impenetrable. The Vaisheshika school of Indian philosophy also believes in the atom as the material cause of the world. They, however, hold that the atoms themselves can not bring out the world from them, so they accept God as an efficient cause.

The Western materialists represented by the atomists are atheists, whereas the *Vaishashikas* are theists. The Samkhya school of the Indian philosophy is materialistic, for, it regards Matter as the cause of the world; but as it believes in many consciousnesses and points out the way of release from the ills of life it is spiritualistic, though it is conspicuous by non-re cognation of God.

Among the Idealists in the western philosophy, there are different types such as the Platonic Idealism, Berkeleyan Idealism and Idealism of Leibniz, Kantian Idealism and Hagelian Idealism.

The Idealistic school which arose in opposition to the materialistic school asserts that the ultimate reality is mind or spirit and not matter. Plato taught that, the things of sense-experience are not real, but are simply copies of 'Ideas' or universal essences of things, which alone are real. Descartes recognised Mind and Matter both and asserted that God is the absolute substance and this (God) alone is real. Mind and Matter are not real.

Leibniz resolves physical objects into monads, each of which is an invisible and indivisible centre of energy. Even God, according to him is a Super-Monad. So he thinks that Monads alone are real. They are many. The Empiricistic school which came into existence later, laid emphasis on sense experience for the comprehension of Reality, but the world 'Sense experience' was interpreted differently by Locke, Berkley and Hume, who were chief exponents of empiricism. In Locke's view, although, matter is experienced by the senses, the fact that the matter apart from ideas such as length, breadth, height, colour, shape etc., has no independent existence, the reality conceived in matter, i.e. in an object like a table, must consist in the ideas only. Berkely revised this view on the ground that the ideas being inherent in mind, it is the mind which is real. Hume opposed this and asserted that matter and not mind was real. These views of conflicting nature, later on, were considered and challenged by Kant who succeeded them. He established the truth of his proposition that matter which was cognised by sense data and mind by reason, are both unreal. They are only phenomenal appearance of ultimate Reality, which is transcendental and which is termed by him as a Thing-in-Itself. Hegel who succeeds him is a rationalist. He established the reality of mind and matter both, which, according to him are the manifestations of the Absolute or ultimate Reality. Mind and matter are the two aspects of the ultimate Reality. The conception of Idealism was further revised by later philosophers and acquired new names such as Voluntaristic idealims of Schopenhaur, the objective idealism of Fichte, and personal idealism of Howinson. Idealism infers the supremacy of spirit or mind in the universe by pre-supposing that, there is a knowing subject (Mind or soul) and the object of knowledge i.e. the world. From the observed facts of the existence of matter and mind, they attempt to explain their relation to supreme Reality. The idealistic school propounded certain principles by which the validity of idealism was taught by them. But that validity was subsequently questioned by a new type of Philosophical system, known as Realism. Idealism was monistic, but the dualistic school recognised mind and matter, a pair of contrasting realities also. Descartes, the father of that school says that the world ultimately consists of two substances, mind which is conscious and matter which is unconscious. The Pluralistic school comprehends reality as many. It says that Reality is infinitely complex and consists of multiple substances, each one being independent and real.

The Atom-school of the Greek philosophers is an early phase of Pluralism and Professor William James' pluralism is its modern phase. Prof. Spaulding also made contribution to it, by giving rise to the new type of pluralism.

Compared with the Western philosophy, the Indian philosophy is rich with deep thinking on the problem of ultimate reality with its various forms like Materialism of Charvaka, Sunyavada or Vijnanvada-(theory of Nihilism or consciousness) of Buddhism, *Syadwada* (TheRelativity theory-Reality in all truths) of Jainism, Nature Theory of the Samkhya and the Yoga systems, the Atomistic theory of the Vaisheshikas, and the Idealism theory of Absolute reality of Shamkaracharya, the qualified non-dualism of Ramanuja, the pure non-dualism of Vallabhacharya, the dualism—cum-non-dualism of Nimbarka and Bhaskara and Dualism of Madhva. Shamkaracharya's teaching of the Reality corresponds to that of Kant in the conception of Supreme Reality and that of Ramanuja and Vallabhacharya with that of Hegel to a certain extent. They hold that ultimate reality is one called '*Brahman*' which has two constituent aspects or units of consciousness (Chit or spirit) and unconsciousness (*Achit* or *Sat* existence). These two, the spirit and matter known as the soul, and the world, Chit and Achit, or to use the terms of the western philosophy, mind and matter, are the qualities according to Ramanuja, and according to Vallabhacharya they are parts of Supreme Reality called Brahman or God. Hence the soul and the world are also real. Reality is one and not many. God reveals Himself as many (as names and forms) by His own Will. The Hindu philosophy teaches that mere knowing Reality is not enough. If the knowledge of Reality does not enable one to realise or experience that Reality in his life, it has no value. To realise or experience the Reality, various means such as of sacrifice, penance, fasts, control of mind, prayers, knowledge, worship, renunciation and devotion have been prescribed. Of these means Shamkaracharya prescribes renunciation which is ruled out by Ramanuja as being not compatible with social life. Ramanuja advocates the means of worship—the combination of knowledge, devotion and action. Vallabhacharya lays stress on devotion or love for God as true means of God-Realisation. It is in pointing out this means of devotion that the real merit of his philosophy lies. The True nature of God and the devotional element by which God is to be realised are the chief features of his philosophy. He is the exponent of the non-dualistic philosophy of God—Realisation both theoretically and practically. Madhva also preached devotion but his philosophy is Dualistic.

CHAPTER — VI

VALLABHACHARYA AS A RENOVATOR OF SOCIAL LIFE.

If our social order is not to go to pieces, if our social thought is not to become incoherent, we must control and give meaning to the outward experiences which are increasingly pouring on us. The principle of dharma, the scales of value, are to be maintained in and through the stress of the new experiences. Only then will it be possible for us to have balanced or integral progress. If we try to adopt inherited codes in changing conditions, instability, if not collapse, will be the result. We should introduce changes to-day, and make the content of Hindu Dharma, relevant to modern conditions.

Dr. Radhakrishnan—Religion and Science p. 115

The achievements of Vallabhacharya in social life in his time should be estimated in the light of the above words of Dr. Radhakrishnan. He made the content of the Hindu Dharma, relevant to his times. Besides being a great Philosopher, a great religious teacher and a mystic, Vallabhacharya was also a great social thinker. Although he spent most of his time in visiting various parts of the country and preaching religious gospel, he was not isolated from the social life of the time. He came in contact with men of all orders in the society, observed and studied their ways of life and was convinced that the old *Vedic* form of the Hindu Religion had little chance of revival in that age. The ceremonies, performed by the priestly class and the followers of the Hindu faith, were practised only mechanically. Under the influence of Islam, the Hindu faith especially the *Sanatana Dharma* was tottering down. Under the name of Dharma wrong things were perpetrated. The social body of the Hindu society in general, was showing signs of feebleness. It was losing health fast, and there was little hope of its recovery from degeneration and decacy. Vallabhacharya felt that Hinduism could not be preserved and rescued unless some strong timely doses in the form of reoriented religions and social concepts were injected into it. He saw that the malady had gone deep into the bowels of the social body. If no remedies were applied to it immediately, all hope of saving the Hindu Society was lost for ever. He, therefore, suggested certain reforms.

He was conserative in the sense, that he practised religious principles, strictly in conformity with the *Vedas*, but in social matters he was liberal. He thought that the *Dharma* required reorientation. The *Dharma* taught by the Smritis was losing its grip on popular mind. It was misunderstood, as signifying performance of sacrifices, practising penance, observing rules of purity, visiting holy places, exercising mental discipline, devoting life to knowledge and worship but the fact that it is inclusive of all these and yet much more was missed from the popular mind. What is called Dharma is an internal urge and inclination of the mind expressed in the form of one's duty to one's self, to society, to mankind and to God. If the *Dharma* does not improve the relations between men and men, and if it does not point the way to the union with God, it is no *Dharma*. The true nature of Dharma makes a man fearless and prevents him from doing injustice to others by harming their interests, or disturbing social solidarity and creating tensions causing disruption of the social orders. It makes him discriminate between what is socially good and bad. It makes him prefer social good to individual good. It also makes him free from. 'I-ness' and 'mine—ness'. It implies the purity of heart and not of the body only. It is not self-love but is universal type of love, which triumphs over distinctions due to caste, creed and colour. Vallabhacharya was a spiritual social reformer. He conserved the spiritual values, by suggesting new reforms in outer social practices. It was his belief that social reforms without religious control was good for nothing. His social philosophy is based upon the sense of Dharma-as universal *Dharma* i. e. Love to all as God's creatures.

The marks of Dharma are fearlessness, purity of heart, contentment of mind, sincerity, compassion to all creatures, and service of mankind. All these are good. If Dharma is not related to God, it has no value. The heart of one devoted to Dharma, overflows with love for all. It delights in doing good to all, and helping them in their needs and difficulties, according to one's ability. It treats all creatures equally as God's beings. It loves truth and justice, and desists from harm or violence. It establishes harmony everywhere and realises oneness of God in all beings. It is a Dharma of the heart and not of the intellect. Vallabhacharya applied his mind to it for a long time in formulating his view on the real nature of Dharma, and taught it to the people as a panacea of all the ills-social, religous, political or spiritual. Before prescribing this, he made a correct diognisis of the disease of the social body. His diognisis, based on his knowledge of the Hindu Philosophy and Religion rescued the Hindu Society from its premature extinction and gave it a permanent lease of life. The Hindu Society not only survived the Islamic attacks but had a long lease of life under the impact of his social philosophy. This is the greatest service by Vallabhacharya to the Hindu Society. He was a reformer, who reformed the society without any disturbance in social life. According to him, sudden change in the existing order of the society, was a blow to it. He did not root out the tree, but removed the cancerous part from it, in an ingenious manner.

Institution of Class System.

As a social reformer he reconsidered the utility of the Vedic system which is one of the characteristic features of the Hindu Society. It dates from the time of the *Vedas*. It flourished usefully in the epic.—*smriti* and the *Pauranic Ages*, but subsequently in course of time, it lost its sap and strength and became almost useless. The present caste system with its innumerable subdivisions is derived from the old class system, in evolutionary stages.

The earliest reference about the existence of the four classes in the *Vedic Age*, is to be found in the famous '*Purusha Sukta* in the 10th *Mandala* of the *Rigveda*. According to it, the four classes of the Hindu Society—the *Brahmanas*, the *Kshatriyas*, the *Vaishyas* and the *Shudras* originated from the different parts of the body of God (*Purusha*)—the *Brahmanas* from His mouth, the *Kshatriayas* from His arms, the *Vaishyas* from His thighs and the *Shudras* from His feet. This description is not to be understood literally, but as representing the qualities and functions of these classes. The Gita also speaks about these divisions based upon the qualities and functions, for which they are qualified to render their respective services to the society (IV-13). From these, it is clear that this institution is not man-made, but God-made. The institution, coming down upto the present time from age to age, is a pre-determined one, not to be altered by human agency. Since God created this world, he also created these divisions or classes for the good of the society. But then, it should be noted that these four divisions were not created as independent and separate, each for its own existence, but as parts of the whole society for mutual co-operation, co-existence and harmonious living, thereby each member of each class individually and each class collectively should seek social good achieving solidarity and unity among them. They were to be regarded not as different bodies but as parts of one body, whose life depended upon the organic unity among the parts. It is to convey this sense that the Gita in the above reference uses the word 'Chaturavarnya'—a collection of four classes in a singular number, and not in plural as 'Chaturavarna.'

A man's class depends upon his qualities and not upon his birth. The caste is not hereditary. If a Brahman possesses the qualities required of his class, he should be regarded as a Brahmana, but if he does not possess those qualities, even if he is born as a Brahman, he should not be considered as a Brahmana. He is unfit as a Brahmana, but a Brahmana only in name. This rule applies to all classes. A man may have been born in any class but if he lacks the qualities of that class, he should not be recognised as a genuine member of that class. So, birth should not be considered as a criterion for ascertaining a class or a caste. The orthodox people, however, believe birth alone as a criterion for determining the caste of a person. In the days of Vallabhacharya, the old class system degenerated into innumerable sub-divisions of castes within castes, and only birth, and not the qualities, became a chief rule of social order. Under the caste system inter-marrying and inter-dining, even among the members of the divisions of the same caste were forbidden.

Vallabhacharya saw the evils of the caste, and wished to reform it, but he did not want to aim a blow at the old class system, because that would be *anti-Vedic* and demolishing a very ancient institution, which gave shelter to people for thousands of years and was very useful, in the preservation, harmony, and integration of the social order. His attitude to caste was that of renovation and not of demolition .He looked upon that problem, philosophically and religiously. The economical and cultural considerations were subsumed under these two.

The qualities which form the very basis of these class-divisions are innate in them and their functions are external expressions.

The qualities are the mental equipment of the class and the functions, its physical expressions. The deciding factors for the class according to the scriptures are the qualities of knowledge—illumination (Sattva), action (Rajas) and inertia (Tamas) respectively. The *Brahmana* class is characterised by illumination, the *Kshatriya* by a mixture of illumination and action the *Vaisyas* by the action only and the *Shudras* by inertia. The Gita enumerates these qualities and functions expected from each class.[1] The control of mind and senses, austerity, purity, forbearance, straightforwardness, faith in God and the scriptures, knowledge of *Brahman* from the scriptures with direct experience, are the qualities of the *Brahmanas*. Prowess, majesty, firmness, bravery, not running away from the battle field, charity and rulership are the qualities of the *Kshatriyas*. The activities of the *Vaishya* are cultivation of crops, tending the cows, and carrying on trade, and those of the *Shudras* are rendering service of other classes.

Vallabhacharya, accepts hereditary nature of the classes, but would not attach importance to birth only as a determinant of the class. To him, the essential basis is the quality-cum-function, which he designates as the theory of the Deity or Divine qualities (Devata Vada). He says that each member of the above classes, is presided over by a certain deity manifesting the qualities of that class. For example the *Brahmana* class is presided over by the Deity called *Brahmanya,* who is manifested by the qualities of peace, mind control, austerity etc. If these qualities are not manifested, even though one is born of the Brahmana parents, he does not deserve to be classed as a Brahmana. There are instances in which persons born of the Brahmana parents were not recognized as such. For example, some sons of *Rishabha* who was a Brahmana, did not acquire status of the Brahmana class.A lso we know of some Brahmanas who, on account of a curse, lost their status and were known as *Shudras*. The scriptures hold that merely, by birth, one will not be a Brahmana, unless the sacred thread ceremony is performed. Vishvamitra was a son of a *Kshatriya,* but he rose to the position of a Brahmana, by his austerity. The Mahabharata enunciates two principles—(1) Performance of sacred thread ceremony and (2) character, for determination of the class of the first three orders. There is also a text stating that all persons are born *Shudras*, but by *Samskaras*, they acquire the status of the three other classes. Just as the qualities determine the class, so also, the functions determine it. These qualities and functions are ordained by God for the purpose of maintaining the social order. It is, therefore, thought necessary that each man, born in a particular class, must cultivate the qualities and do functions of his class, and thereby, be a useful member of the society. The Brahmanas should serve society by intellect, advancing education, learning, and religiosity, the *Kshatriyas* by their valour, protecting men against enemies and establishing peace and order by a good administration as rulers, and the *Vaishyas*, by activities contributing to the progress in industry, commerce and agriculture, and the *Shudras* by doing physical labour for the welfare of the whole society. The ideal was, that each was to contribute to the well-being of the society. Nobody had personal motives in his vocation. Each man was required to make livelihood fixed for his caste. In short, God created social class of the Brahmanas for the diffusion of education (Jnana), the Kshatriyas for protection (Raksha), the Vaishyas for supplying means of livelihood (Ajivika) and the Shudras for service to all other classes. The aim of the Brahman class is achievement of freedom, that of the *Kshatriya* social good happiness, of the *Vaishyas*, social prosperity and progress and of the *Shudras*, service. In the opinion of Vallabhacharya the *Shudra* is the highest, in the sense that he renders service to the society disinterestedly. Each individual in the society should do the duty of the class to which he belongs and not that of other classes. By shirking the duty of his class, incumbent on him and doing that of other classes, he cannot achieve his spiritual good. Vallabhacharya says that theoretically this is a good ideal, but in this age, it is very difficult to practise. At present each man has deviated from the duty of his class and maintains himself by the livelihood of other classes. He regrets this state of things but admonishes that one should accept the social condition as it is, as due to the Will of God, and even in such a state, one must make the best use of the opportunities for rendering service to God, which is the chief ideal of a man's life. A man may belong to any social class, but should feel that he is given birth in a particular class, for rendering service to God. Instead of suggesting a revolutionary programme, he recommends a compromise. The old social classes were good but their offshoots into so many castes are an evil, no doubt, but even this evil has to be recognised by taking care, that it does not hamper spiritual progress. A man may belong to any caste or sub-caste, carry on any work for his maintenance; but, if he does his duty honestly and sincerely and regards it as an offering to God, he will not be acting against the scriptures.

---

[1] B. G. XVIII-42-44.

The Shudras.

The *Shudras* have been given low status from the *Vedic* times in the Hindu Society. They, as a class, were not treated as equals with the other three classes. They were not allowed to perform religious ceremonies or enter the places of sacrifices. They were banned from studying the *Vedas* and putting on the sacred thread. In course of time, they were not allowed even to possess property. Vallabhacharya believes that they are not a degraded class, if they do service of God, through service of other classes. The *Shudras* in his opinion are the best of the social classes, if they lead a devotional life. He raises no disabilities against them in religious matters. He will accord them every right of God-worship as devotees; but he will not disturb the prevailing social order, by conceding to them rights of other classes in social relationship.

The Hindu Muslim Unity.

Vallabhacharya kept himself away from politics, but believed in Hindu-Muslim unity through culture and religion. Just as he has thrown open the portals of his faith to the *Shudras* and the untouchables, so also he threw them open to the Muslims, if they were very ardent about it. Under his influence, the Muslim rulers relaxed their attempts of proselytising the Hindus to the Muslim faith. His son Vitthalesha followed his father's liberal policy in this matter. He was a very practical Acharya. He thought that the solidarity of the Hindu community could be maintained by that liberal policy. Emperor Akbara honoured him for his catholicity and fellow-feeling. He often visited him to have his *Darshana* and listen to his sermons. He conferred upon him the honorific title of Goswami and also granted him and his descendents some privileges, viz. the grazing of his cattle, non-molestation of his cows, protection of his property and exemption from taxes by special firmans. Some times some legal cases of complicated matters between the Hindus versus the Muslims were referred to his arbitration by the emperor. His son Jahangira following the foot steps of his father showed his sympathetic attitude towards Vallabhacharya's faith. The records of this faith are full of many notable examples of the Muslim devotees. Some of them may be referred to here.

Alikhana Pathan, who was in charge of the land of *Vraja* as an administrator, during the regime of Sikandarshah Lody, the emperor of Delhi, was initiated in the path of Pushti. He was a disciple of Vithaleshji. He used to offer divine service to the image of Thakurji Madan Mohanji—a form of Krishna. He always attended Vallabhacharya's discourses of the Bhagavata. He had so much love for Vraja—where Krishna spent early days of his life, that he had issued strict orders, banning the plucking off leaves or cutting of the branches of the trees in that land. He made his permanent residence in Vraja. It is said, that he was so much fascinated with the love for Krishna that, he used to wander like a mad man in search of Krishna. His daughter Khan Jadi, also was devoted to the service of Lord Krishna. She was an ardent lover of his faith. She remained unmarried and spent her life in experiencing pangs of separation from Krishna. It is said that Krishna, pleased by her devotion, blessed her with His revelation to her.

Tansena, known as the King of Musicians at the court of the Emperor Akbara, accepted Vitthaleshaji-the son of Vallabhacharya, as his preceptor. He has composed some songs in praise of Krishna's *lila*. One Muslim lady Kunjari, who was very thirsty, and was on the verge of death was saved by Vitthalesha, by giving her water reserved for Divine service, embraced his faith and set an example of an ideal devotee. Bagikhana though a muslim accepted the discipleship of Vitthalesji. Rasakhana was a great favourite of Vitthaleshji. He was a great devotee of Krishna. Like Suradas, a great poet of Hindi, he himself wrote many songs describing the *lilas* of Krishna. Rasakhana's 'Kirtanas' are sung, even now, before the image of God in the holy shrines of the Pushti Marga. Many Hindus went to him for receiving instructions in religious matters. There is a story of a Pathan boy, recorded in 'Two hundred and fifty two Vaishnava followers of Vitthalesha' that, when he accepted the Vaishnava faith, his parents were opposed to it. They requested the Muslim ruler of that place to dissuade him from changing his faith. The ruler used all possible methods of coercion to give up his new faith, but he was firm like a rock and did not budge even an inch from his resolve of accepting the faith of the Pushti Marga, so, the ruler had to allow him his wish.

There are many such examples of the Muslims, having embraced the faith of Vallabhacharya. If any deserving Muslim expressed his willingness to accept his faith, Vallabhacharya did not object to it on the ground of his being Muslim. He would not recommend interdining and intermarrying between the Hindus and the Muslims but he would not shut the doors of religion against them as they were equally qualified for a religions life, according to the Hindu scriptures.

From these examples we can say that Vallabhacharya and his son Vitthalesa made a large contribution to the Hindu-Muslim Unity, which is unparallelled in history during the Muslim regime. It is a unique achievement and triumph of his religious policy even in the political field.

Vallabhacharya had a sympathetic regard, even for the so-called untouchables. He admitted them to the path of devotion. In his faith, there are some notable devotees, whose examples are recorded in the books. According to the stories of Eighty four Vaishnavas and The stories of Two hundred and fifty two Vaisnavas, one Patho Gujari was a favourite of Vitthaleshji. It is said that one Chauda, a follower of Vitthaleshji, who belonged to the untouchable class, was specially favoured by Vithaleshji on account of his extreme yearning for the Darshana of Shrinathji. One Chahuda—a follower of Vitthaleshji defeated learned scholars, in a controversy concerning religious matters. Vallabhacharya and Vithaleshji were very liberal to the untouchables. They did not deny their right to religious life. They had the same rights for devotional life, as the other Hindu castes, provided they were clean in their food and dress, and were really sincere in their desire for being admitted to the path of devotion. Though the Hindu society was reluctant to remove the social restrictions against them, Vallabhacharya, without interferring and disturbing the status quo made them fit for religious life, *preserving of course the spirit of the Smritis* *and other scriptures.* The way of acquiring fitness is cleanliness of body and food, purity of heart by virtuous conduct, etc. and the desire for a devotional life. If they possess these qualities, they are fit to contact holy men, attend religious sermons, participate in singing divine songs, and to *have the Darshanas of God's image in the shrine from a distance.*

Attitude towards Women

Towards women in general Vallabhacharya's attitude was highly advanced in consonance with the religious spirit of the scriptures. He regards them as equals of men. He accords them the same position, which was held by them in the Vedic period when, they enjoyed rights equal to those of men for a religious life. Husband and wife both took part in the sacrifices. Wives offered prayers with their husbands. They were not precluded from the study of the Vedas. The girls were allowed to put on the sacred thread. Some women like Maitreyi and Gargi could participate in philosophical discussions. Some women like *Vac* are famous as composers of the Vedic hymns. There were two types of women, *Brahma-Vadini,* who remained unmarried throughout life and devoted their time to the learning of *Brahma-Vidya,* and others who were *Sadyovahini,* who married. This position of women began to deteriorate from the time of the Mahabharata and, in subsequent ages in consequence degeneration of women reached the climax. During the age of Vallabhacharya the position of women, under the impact of Muslim civilisation, was the lowest. They were very backward socially, economically, and culturally. Vallabhacharya endeavoured to ameliorate their position in the religious way. During the Smriti period, women suffered from various disabilities, which included religious disability banning them from the pursuit of the Vedic study. In this respect they were put on par with the Shudras, but the Gita made the ban futile by admitting women to the path of devotion (B.G. X-32).

Vallabhacharya does not make any distinction between men and women, because they are identical in having souls. According to him, the devotees having the body of a man or of a woman, but possessed of the qualities like love, steadfastness, Self-abnegation, penance etc., are better qualified for God's love than mere males or females, devoid of these qualities. So merely having a woman's body does not qualify her for devotional life, but the above qualities. The Gopis who possessed these qualities are ideal women, fit for God's grace. He pays them highest tribute of eulogy by calling them the Gurus in the path of devotion. In the Karika portion of his Subodhini, Vallabhacharya says that women alone are fit for the bliss of devotion and their husbands can acquire fitness through their wives (Bhg. X-29). In the Subodhini on the Venu Gita, (Bhg. X-18-5) he says that the love of the type of a woman for her lover is the real love in the Pushti Marga for God-realisation. It is an ideal love, because it is free from vulgarity of sexuality and capable of sacrifice, suffering and facing all kinds of difficulties, trials and tribulations (Bhg.S.3-14.K.-13) In his opinion a woman is a better teacher even than an Acharya, because knowledge or instruction received from her has an immediate effect on the recepient. In his sympathy for women, he says that if a tear falls from the eyes of a woman on account of her molestation or persecution by men, the earth will lose its fertility. Vallabhacharya is always full of praise for good women, though he condemns wicked women. They are a bane, a cause of men's downfall and degradation. Hearts of bad women are like those of wolves. (Bhg. X-33-40) He supports love marriage as an ideal marriage and ignores even a caste barrier, if it interferes with it. One Ramdasa, a disciple of Vallabhacharya who ill-treated his wife and abandoned her, was advised by him to reconcile with his wife. He accepted his advice and lived with his wife a happy life. Rana Vyasa and Jagannatha Joshi, both the disciples of Vallabhacharya saved one Rajput lady from death by burning on a funeral pyre as a Sati after her husband's death. The lady was advised by them to seek guidance of Vallabhacharya, which she did and turned a new leaf in her life. He sympathised even with prostitutes, by admitting them to the path of devotion (The story No. 9 in 'Eighty four Vaishnavas)'. One Krishnadasa, one of the eight poet disciples of Vallabhacharya's faith, having been captivated by melodious music of one prostitute made friendship with her and presented her to Lord Shrinathji, before whom, she used to sing songs of God's *lilas*. The marriage of a son of one Bania with the daughter of a minister, who was Rajput by birth, was approved by Vitthaleshji when he knew that they were sincere in their love. He and his son Vitthalesji did not openly encourage inter caste marriages, but if among the Vaishnavas, a youth and a girl of different castes really loved each other and married, they did not object to it. There are examples of women belonging to the Shudra and aboriginal classes who were accepted in this faith for devotional life. Several of them experienced God's love. He exhorted his disciples to get themselves married, so that as husband and wife they both would devote themselves to the joint service of God. The object of a householder's life, according to Vallabhacharya, is service of God and not enjoyment of sexual pleasures. The married life is to be enjoyed with a view to getting children, who can be helpful in the service of God. Husband and wife are advised to love each other, live in peace and do service of God together. A Vaishnava must not shun his wife, unless she proves a hindrance to him in the service of God. He is even bound to maintain her even then.

Attitude to the Vedas.

The Vedas are the earliest sacred works of the Hindu, trustworthy for philosophical and religious knowledge. They are four—Rig, Sama, Yajur and Atharva. The word 'Veda' means knowledge. These 'Vedas' are so called because they are repositories of knowledge. They give knowledge about two subjects—(a) sacrifice, and (b) Supreme Reality. The portion of the 'Veda' which deals with Sacrifice is called 'Purva Kanda' and the portion dealing with knowledge is called 'Uttarkanda'. Sacrifice is independently treated in the works called 'Brahmans' and knowledge in the '*Aranyakas*' and the Upanishadas.

Shamkara accepts only the Uttarkanda as an authority and Jaimini only the Purvakanda. Ramanuja ,and Vallabhacharya accept both, as of equal importance. According to him, there is no opposition between these two parts, because sacrifice and knowledge are the two powers of God, each of which is given independent treatment in each Kanda. Although Shamkara accepts the authority of the Upanishadas, yet, when he is perplexed about the nature of Brahman which is described both as Indeterminate and Determinate, he prefers the former Brahman to the latter, and rejects the Shritis supporting Determinate Brahman. So according to Shamkara all Shrutis are not equally valuable. In such a case, he will not resort to the Shrutis but to reason. He says that, if there is a conflict between the Shrutis and reason, the latter must be given preference to the former. Thus, Shamkara does not accept the entire Vedas consisting of the *Purva Kanda* and the *Uttara Kanda* as authoritative. Again he does not accept all the Shritis from the *Uttar-Kanda* as authoritative. Vallabhacharya, on the other hand, accepts the entire Vedas—consisting of both the parts as authoritative and of equal value. As for the Shritis, all are trustworthy, without any exception. He is against making any distinction in the body of the Vedas. The Gita is the speech of God, but the Vedas are the vital breath of God. It is a crime to dissect the body of the Vedas into limbs or parts and recognise some parts as genuine and reject others. *Purva Kanda* deals with God's power of work and the *Uttara Kanda*, on God's power of knowledge; both are integral and necessary, each co-operating with the other, for the organisation, preservation and maintenance of the body, in the form of the whole Vedas. Vallabhacharya has noted this point in his 'Anu Bhasya' commentary on the Brahma Sutras (1-1-7). Work and knowledge belong to *Dharmin*—God, so there is no opposition between the two (B.S. 1-1-3). He says that those who accept only one part of the Vedas neglecting the other, ought to be ignored. They interpret the Vedas not as they are but as their fancy guides them. It militates against the spirit of the Vedas which are not to be explained arbitrarily. The Vedic truth is cent per cent purified gold. It is not to be undervalued by a mixture of any base metal in the form of extraneous matter. Any attempt towards distortion or perversion of the Vedic truth by wrongi nterpretation, deserves downright condemnation (Bha. II-7-37K). Vallabhacharya accepts the Vedas as an exclusive authority. He rejects other Pramanas such as perception, etc. They may be good for knowledge of worldly objects, but not for the knowledge of God. He holds the Vedas in the highest esteem. He attaches so much importance to the Vedas, that he says that everything written in it, even though it may seem to our scientific mind, impossible, incredible or fake, must be believed in, because some times, incredible things mentioned in the Vedas, should be accepted as indicative of events in the future. The Vedas are not only trustworthy for the past, but also for the present and the future. They are not like historical works, written with a view to describing the past happenings, but are the writings which serve as guides to the individuals and the nations, in their spiritual development, for all times. They are universal and perennial works, useful to those who seek inspiration and guidance from them, for spiritual development.

By the knowledge of the Purva Kanda, one knows the nature of sacrifice which represents the action-form of God and by the knowledge of the Uttara Kanda, the nature of God as knowledge and realises Him. Each part is complimentary to the other. He, who has known the entire Vedas, will understand that the object of the Vedas is to teach the supremacy of devotion as a means of God-realisation. The real sacrifice or work of a devotee is service of God by consecration and the real knowledge, the knowledge of the Love-form of God and His realisation by His grace.

Institution of Sacrifices.

It is a very old institution—as old as the Vedas. It is the main subject of the 'Purva Kanda' of the Vedas i.e. the 'Samhitas' and 'Brahmanas'. It is accepted by Jaimini as the main teaching of the Vedas. It was discarded by the Buddhistic school in toto and partially by Shamkara, who, however, accepts its utility as a purificatory means of mind which is essential as a preliminary condition to one seeking spiritual development through knowledge. Ramanuja and Vallabhacharya both recognise its utility for a religious life. The Gita has also recognised its worth. But the Gita says that every action of a man is a kind of a sacrifice and it should be done for the propitiation of God. It should be performed as one's sreligious duty without regard of fruit. The Gita supports the Vedic sacrifices also and asserts that those who enjoy the gifts of God without offering them to Him are sinners. (III-13). It explains the philosophy of the sacrifice by identifying not only the sacirfice but also all its accessories with God (III-15). It enumerates different kinds of the sacrifices, viz. sacrifices to be performed by materials, by self control, penance, Yoga, austere vows, wisdom, study of sacred texts etc. (IV-26-30). Having thus mentioned different kinds of sacrifices, the Gita observes, that of all kinds of sacrifices, that of knowledge is the best (IV-33). It should be noted here that the Gita teaches the value of a sacrifice to Arjuna who is recognised by Krishna as his devotee. It means that his sacrifice must be of such a kind that it may help him in achieving the knowledge of God. Vallabhacharya classifies sacrifices into three kinds—(1) Those performed for the fulfilment of one's desires, whose goal is attainment of heaven (2) Those performed without desires, but for spiritual happiness. (3) Those performed solely with a dessire of God-realisation, for the goal of union with God and enjoyment of His bliss. These three kinds of sacrifices are called by him as *Adhibhautika*, *Adhyatmika* and *Adhidaivika* sacrifices. He, being an Acharya of the Bhakti cult, appreciates only the last type. In his faith, he has evolved the Divine service mode, which to him is the Adhidaivika sacrifiice. He follows the Gita concept of a sacrifice, but suggests that the highest kind of a sacrifice—the Adhidaivika-is a means of God-realisation. The sacrifices mentioned in the Gita III & IV are all included by Vallabhacharya in the first two divisions given above. The last division, Adhidaivika, is his own discovery, a unique contribution to the teaching of the Gita. He has accepted the sacrifices and divides them into high, higher and highest types, and teaches that those who seek God must practise the highest type in the form of the service of God.

Every selfless act of an individual's life, rendered as service to humanity or to God is deemed by him as a sacrificial act. The highest kind of a sacrifice is the service of God.

Self-Control (Yoga)

'Yoga' is one mode of spiritual life as recommended by the *Svetasvataropanishad* (II-12). The Gita also teaches it as one of the disciplines for God-realisation which differs in its meaning of the Yog from that used by Patanjali, the traditional founder of the Yoga system. The Gita uses the word Yoga in the sense 'of union with God'. Each chapter of the Gita is titled as a particular kind of Yoga, by which the soul can be united with God. Patanjali does not understand it in that sense, but as a spiritual effort to attain perfection through controal of body, senses and mind, and through right discrimination between Purusha and Prakriti. Chapters V & VI of the Gita deal with the Yoga or self-control as a mental discipline. It is defined variously in the Gita as 'proficiency in actions', 'state of equipoise' and 'freedom from all pain and misery'. Gita's concept of the Yoga is not negative like that of Patanjali. According to Patanjali, it is supra-conscious concentration in which the meditatior and the object of meditation are completely fused together, without consciousness of the object of meditation (God). Gita's Yoga is the state of union with God in which the individual self enjoys the eternal bliss with Brahman. (VI-28). It is not enough that the senses and mind should be withdrawn from the worldly objects, but that they should be directed to God. They should be always engaged in thinking about God and experiencing God's love. A Yogin, who directs his mind and senses to God and experiences God's love, is the highest Yogi. (VI-47)

Vallabhacharya recommends it for union with God, in which a devotee can enjoy bliss of God's love, which is the aim of his life. This love is to be experienced in two states (1) in the state of service time, and (2) in the state of non-service time, when the devotee should engage his mind in thinking of God and experiencing pangs of separation from Him. Vallabhacharya substitutes the word *Nirodha* as a better word, than the Yoga in place of Patanjali. In Patanjali's method, mind is to be controlled by suppression; but Vallabhacharya's method is the method of sublimation by which the desires of the devotees are not suppressed but they are enjoined in the service of God.

Vallabhacharya adumbrates three divisions of Yogas (1) The inferior kind by which one seeks to possess certain supranormal powers (2) the mediocre kind, by which one seeks liberation (3) the superior kind which is for experiencing God's love only. However he recommends only the last one. In short, he says that the aim of Yoga is not merely mind control but participation in God's bliss, in union with God. It is a positive way in which the mind, though detached from worldly love, is attached to God, seeking God's love. The value of Yoga is recognised, only if it proves to be helpful in the soul's union with God.

Tapas-Penance

The old idea of Tapas-'Penance' 'voluntarily suffering pains', is not acceptable to Vallabhacharya. Inflicting pain on one's body is not a desirable and good method for God-realisation. Many a time it has produced disastrous effects on one practising penance and has failed as a methhod of mind control. If penances are not directed to experience God's love, they are good for nothing. They have, however, their value in experiencing God's love, in the state of the soul's separation from God. It is not suffering, self inflicted bodily pains or tortures; but rather a mental state of enduring pangs of love in separation from God. Such penance is highly commended. It is not an independent means, but is one of the ingredients of devotion of the love-type in the Vyasana state.

Prayers

Prayers are a chief feature of Christianity, Islam and some other religions. They also constitute one of the features of Hinduism, but to Vallabhacharya the idea of prayers for asking boons of worldly kinds from God is not commendable. Prayers are good for the purification of heart, but should not be resorted to, for askiing favours from God, such as securing health, wealth, children, power, victory, fame etc. That is not the proper use of prayers. By asking for these, through prayers, the devotee betrays his trust in God. Does not God know his wants? Why should he, then, pray for these things? Again by asking for them, he may get less than what God might have otherwise blessed on him. He must know that his life is strictly ordained by the Will of God which is always for the universal as well as his individual good. If one suffers from any difficulties, he should think that God has sent them for his spiritual development. Sufferings are sometimes ordeals for testing the true love for God. One does not know what is behind God's will. It is the duty especially of a devotee, to submit himself humbly to God's will and do his duty cheerfully and fearlessly with faith in God, and God is sure to protect him. Asking for worldy things is not true devotion. A devotee of God seeks only the love of God, so his devotion must be free from personal desires. In his *Viveka Dhairya Ashraya*, Vallabhacharya says, "What is the good in doubting the purpose of God by offering Prayers? All things, everywhere, belong to Him, and all power is His. In 'Nava Ratna Grantha' he admionishes that also devotee should be free from all anxieties. In troubles, he should remember God and think that they are blessings in disguise from God. He, however, does not doubt efficacy of prayers. They have also value but Vallabhacharya says, that they should be resorted to, for securing the love of God. Prayers may be offered for the purification of one's heart, and freedom from the sense of egoism; but not for procurement of worldy gifts from God. Hymns in praise of God called *stotras* should be sung, instead of prayers. They will tend to increase only faith in God. By praising God, we accept His mastery over us, and become conscious of His guardianship, which gives us strength enough to resist against dangers and difficulties. The Gopi-Gita in the 10th book of the Bhagavata is the best prayer. It is the prayer by the Gopis, who expressed in it their ardent longing for God's revelation (Darshana). The prayer of demon Vrutra, in the 6th book of the Bhagavata, is a well known typical example of an ideal prayer. In his prayer, he did not ask for heavenly happiness, Yogic powers, the position of a creator, liberation and sovereignty over the whole world, but asked for God's lov eonly. He says "Oh, God, I do not ask from you for anything except you. If I have you, I have all. If I do not have you, although I may have all, I have nothing. Like a newly born bird anxiously waiting for the arrival of its mother, or a hungry calf for its mother-cow, or a woman long separated from her husband, I have been anxiously waiting for you. Oh, my love, come to me and bless me". The prayer offered by the maidens of Vraja to Katyayani for a boon to have Krishna as their lover, is the highest type of prayers. The prayer of Kunti, the mother of the Pandavas, offered for acknowledgment of obligations of God, and that of Bhishma, expressing repentance, on the point of death, are of the second type, and that by Gajendra in the Bhagavata, for rescue from an alligator, is of the lowest order. For a follower of Pushti Marga, the ideal prayer is the prayer by the Gopis or the prayer by the maidens of Vraja to Katyayani.

Faith in God

Unshaken faith in God is most essential for seeker of Gopis' love. Even the slightest deviation from it, will poison the love for God. Faith should be a guiding principle in a devotee's life. This faith must be in one single form of God, to be singled out by a devotee, out of many forms of God. Love for God must not be directed to many Gods and Goddesses, but should flow continuously and straight to one God, without diversion. God's love is the root of devotional life. As the growth of a tree requires sprinkling of water, to be poured over the root and not the trunk, branches and leaves etc. so, for the growth of devotion, our love should be directed only to the root of all i.e. God. It should be nurtured with care and precaution with a calm spirit of resignation to God. Faith in Vallabhacharya's teaching is a cardinal principle as in Christianity, to be maintained at all costs and risks. Vallabhacharya makes it imperative for the devotee. On all occasions such as, of misery, evil, sin, lack of devotion, harassment from the devotees and the members of one's family, one's masters and servants, in poverty, difficulty of maintenance, sickness, ill-treatment by the disciples, opposition from society etc. (V.D.A.-11-13) God should be remembered. One should never be faithless, for, it is a hindrance in religious life. Vallabhacharya is a monotheist in a strict sense of the term. He believes only in Krishna as God. Faith according to him is faith in Krishna only, not even in other incarnations of God or in Gods and goddesses. It is a pre-condition to the devotee's getting love for God.

Morality

To the Hindu mind, just as light is inseparable from the Sun, so is morality from religion. The Smriti works are considered as Works prescribing the ethical rules for various classes. But they are at a discount now a days. Rules of morality are derived from within, and not from outside. These rules are not static. They have to be changed under new circumstances. Our morality has three aspects. One for one's own self, second for the society in which one lives, and third for the attainment of liberation. First two are relative, but the last one is absolute. Vallabhacharya's approach to morality is from the stand point of devotional life. In this respect, he has been influenced by the Gita and the Bhagavata. For him, devotional life presupposes morality. It is rather a seed of devotion. Since devotion is for the love of God, our moral behaviour must be compatible with love of God. It must be an aid to devotion. In devotional life, they often go hand in hand. If devotion is a substance, it is a shadow. If devotion is the sun, it is its disc. In spite of this, a devotee may have to ignore morality at times, when it hampers his devotional act. Morality should conduce to the development of religious life. The Gita regards it essential for all religious men, whether men of action, of knowledge, recluses, the Yogins or devotees. While emphasising its importance, the Gita analyses the concept of morality under certain virtues which are deemed necessary either for devotion or knowledge. In Ch. XII the virtues described are the marks of a devotee and those in Ch. XIII, the marks of a man of knowledge. Dr. Ranade believes that all the moral virtues taught by the Gita are as exemplifications or specifications or exfoliations of the one central virtue of God-devotion. Virtues of a Sthita-Pragna in Ch. II are virtues expected of a devotee. Having stressed the need of cultivating moral virtues, the Gita says that for God-realisation, one may go beyond morality. (XVII-65). This is called supermoralism. This is to be reached by transcendance of the gunas of Prakriti, which is possible only either by continuous stay in the purified Sattva or by inviolably unswerving devotion called Avyabhicharini Bhakti. This in the language of the Gita is called Bhakti Yoga, whose aim is Godrealisation (VI-28, V-24, VI-27) where there is enjoyment of bliss from touch with God-Brahmasamsparsha. Vallabhacharya appreciates moral virtues only in their being an aid to the service of God. A man may be an ideal moralist, his life may be exemplary to others as a most virtuous man, but if he is cut off from devotional life, his virtues are not worth any salt, for, Vallabhacharya believes that the end of virtues is to realise God. The Gita discriminates between the divine virtues and demonical ones and asserts that the divine virtues are conducive to liberation and demoniacal ones to bondage. In his work 'Tattva Dipa Nibandha', he says that although all moral virtues are worth having, still, if one is not able to practise them all, these three should not be ignored. They are (1) compassion to all creatures, (2) contentment with what you have, and (3) complete restraint over senses. In his work 'Viveka Dhairya Ashraya' he mentions, Discrimination, patience and Refuge in God as chief virtues of a follower of Pushti Marga. Being conscious of the difficulties in practising the moral virtues, strictly in conformity with the scriptures, he has relaxed their rigidity, by making allowances in special circumstances, but in acts done with reference to God, he cautions that the moral virtues are to be practised according to one's ability and means or circumstances, but the acts which are not moral should be completely shunned and that the senses should be perfectly controlled (T. D. N. II-238). The sum and substance of all this is that morality is valued only as an aid to devotional life. It must be helpful in God-realisation. If it interferes with it, then there is nothing wrong in discarding it, for, to a devotee love for God and God's love is the only goal of life.

Institution of Property:

Question of property, whether it should be private or public is a burning question of the present time. In Vallabhacharya's age all property in the possession of an individual was respected as private. The rights of the possessor were not overridden even by the state, but Vallabhacharya's view in this matter is that although the property earned by a man is his private property, a devotee who has taken a vow of consecration must regard it as God's property. He is to hold it only as a trustee and use it in the service of God. A devotee has no right to appropriate it for his personal happiness or for the happiness of his family. This does not mean that he has to be indifferent to the needs of himself or of his family . It only means that before using anything which is a devotee's possession, it must be first dedicated to God, and then it should be used as God's favour by him and the members of his family. There is no objection to earning wealth and increasing property, but it should be used only in the service of God and in rendering help to the needy in the name of God. Holding property is not a sin, but not to use it in God's service,is a sin. It is God's property, and as such, must be used for God's purpose. It is wrong if we believe that we acquire property by our own intelligence or by the sweat of our brow. It is God's will, that a man acquires property. He has, no doubt, to make efforts for it but the reward depends on the will of God. By a vow of consecration, the devotee of Pushti Marga forgoes his title of the ownership of his property and transfers it for ever to God. He can, however, spend it in satisfying the minimum of his wants to enable him to render undistracted service of God. This is how Vallabhacharya has removed the evil of private property. Property used in the service of God is not an evil though it is even private.

Wealth

He has no objection to the earning of money. A householder needs wealth, for the upkeeping of his family. He should, earn money in an honest and truthful way by following the profession of his class. Money itself is not an evil but its wrong use is an evil. The Right use of money is to spend it in the service of God. In Tattva Dipa Nibandha, he says that a true devotee should renounce wealth completely, for it is an obstacle in experiencing God's love .If, however, it is not possible to renounce it, it should be used in service of God (II-251).

Vallabhacharya did not discriminate between the rich and the poor. Society might have created differences among them; but to him, both are equally fit for admission to the path of devotion, provided they are earnest and pure of heart and sincere believers in God. There were many rich people among his followers like Raja Ashakarana, Raja Todarmala, Sheth Purushottama of Benares, Birbal, and others; but he was always affectionate towards the poor in general. At times, he inquired about their financial circumstances and helped them in their difficulties. He did not consider money as an evil by itself, but exhorted his followers, to earn it in honest and truthful ways and not to be a slave of it. He told them, "God appreciates better the service of the poor than that of the rich. It is not the means but love behind them, which is of utmost importance in the service of God." He regarded money as a gift of God and, as such, it belonged to God. So it should be used in the service of God. Personally he rigidly adhered to this principle in his own case. He never used any gifts for his personal use. He declined to accept gift even in the form of a large quantity of gold presented to him by king Krishnarai of Vijayanagar on the occasion of his victory over the Pandits of the Shamkara school in a religious dispute. He advised the king to distribute it among the Brahmanas. One Narharadasa, a Godia Brahmana, earned a lot of money from his business, and requested Vallabhacharya to accept from him a gift of a big amount of money, but he declined and asked him to present it to God Jagannatha. He did not believe in hoarding money. His life being simple, his personal wants were very few. He could do without money even in extreme need. Most of his followers came from the class that was wedded to poverty. They knew that wealth was a cause of pride which was a great hindrance in devotion. Narandas, one of his followers, considered money as 'refuge'. Santdas Chopada, who had once seen palmy days in his life, by a sudden frown of fortune was reduced to extreme poverty. His daily earning fell low to 2 pice only. Though he was monetarily in extremely straitened circumstances, he did not condescend to accept the gift of gold coins from a fellow, Vaishnava Narandasa. Padmanabhadasa, a Pandit and reciter of the Bhagavata and whose devotion to Vallabhacharya next to

God, accepted poverty voluntarily and devoted himself to the service of God. He had so much impoverished himself that he had nothing to presennt to God as food in his daily service, so he had to present parched gram to the image of the Lord. Vitthaleshji, the son of Vallabhacharya, also followed his father's example. He, no doubt, received gifts from his followers but made them over to God. In conformity with his father's precept, he would not accept ill-gotten money, nor money which he thought proved hindrance in due service of God. He was against hoarding money. Once a big merchant, wished to present him a big amount of money as a gift. He went to see him just at the time when Vitthaleshji was engaged in the divine service. He was disappointed, for, Vitthaleshaji declined his gift, which according to him, was a cause of mental disturbance when he was engaged in God's service. One Kayastha of Surat, who was a Suba to the Emperor of Delhi, made to him an offer of Rupees fifty thousands if he would arrange for his *Darshana* of *Thakurji* before its scheduled time, but no response was received from him. Similarly, he refused to accept the big amount of money offered to him as gift by two rich women, Ladbai and Dharbai. One poor man Patel by caste who came to pay his respects to him, along with other rich people was hesitating, because he had nothing to present except a garland of flowers; but Vitthaleshaji himself relieved him of his anxiety by asking for it. The two works—'The stories of Eighty four Vaishnavas' and 'The Stories of Two hundred and fifty two Vaishnavas' are full of such accounts. He believed that earning money or not earning it, depends upon the will of God. If he gets money it is to be used in God's service. If one is poor he should regard his poverty as a blessing from God and render service to Him. Service to God does not require means, but only absolute surrender and love for Him.

Hospitality:

Hospitality is a prominent characteristic of Vallabhacharya's faith. The Gita says, "A man who eats food without offering it to God is a great sinner. He does not eat food but sin. The food which he eats is nothing but God's gift."

Vallabhacharya prohibits every Vaishnava from eating food before its presentation to the image of his *Thakorji* . It is the duty of Vaishnava not to eat the food presented to God as food, but take it as God's *prasada* (favour) which should be shared by other Vaishnavas. A Vaishnava never fails in his welcome reception to another Vaishnava visiting his house as his guest. He expects that some Vaishnavas as guests should bless him by their visit. Even a poor Vaishnava would heartily welcome the day, when a fellow Vaishnava visits his house. He will spare no means in extending his warm welcome to him. Krishnabhatta of Ujjain was well known for his hospitality to the Vaishnavas. He was sad if no Vaishnava was his guest. Being rich, he honoured them with gifts of money and other things needed by them. There is a story recorded in 'The Stories of Two Hundred and Fifty two Vaishnavas' about one couple of Gujarat, whose poverty was so extreme that their daily saving did not exceed a pice. Inspite of their poverty, they did not yield to any one in their hospitality to the Vaishnavas. From his daily savings he made a fortune of a rupee, which was spent in purchasing a saree (a garment) for the wife. Now, one day it so happened that some Vaishnavas visited their house. They were in difficulty because they had no means to buy food stuffs for their reception. But the husband with the concurrence of his wife, sold that Saree, and purchased food stuffs, and entertained the visitors, the wife during their stay hours remaining away from the sight of the visitors in a naked pose. There have been examples of the Vaishnava devotees who have preferred starvation to reluctance in hospitality to the Vaishnavas. Such a high sense of hospitality is rare.

Art:

Vallabhacharya's Pushti Marga is distinguished from other Hindu Religions by its special recognition of Art in religious life. There are various theories about Art. The modern school holds the theory of Art for Art's sake. Ruskin in the West declared its end to be moral. If art does not lead to moral life, it is not worth having. The Hindu theory of Art in the earliest days of the Vedas was that it must be religious. It must enable one to realise God. It is not meant for demonstration or appreciation or reward. Vallabhacharya's view is that the purpose of Art is to be instrumental in the service of God. It has no other aim except experiencing love of God by a devotee. The pictures, music, dance etc. have value in so far as they are instrumental in the service of

God. Just as the end of knowledge is release from worldly bondage, so the end of art is release from worldly bondage, not only release, but attainment of God and a blessing of participation in His bliss. In other words, Art is valued by Vallabhacharya only as a means of experiencing or realising God in religious life. In ancient India, every temple had on its walls pictures depicting scenes from the Mahabharat, the Ramayana and the Bhagavata, so that those who saw them had inspiration for religious life. The Vaishnava temples have pictures depicting Krishna's lilas, described in the Bhagavata. On particular festive occasions, screens called *Pichawai,* with scenes of Krishna's *lilas* are displayed behind the image of *Thakorji* in the shrines of Vallabhacharya's faith. The idea behind it is not decoration, but making the devotees remember and contemplate upon God's *lilas.* Vitthleshji was a great lover of art, not only that, but he himself was a painter. A beautiful picture of *Navanita priyaji,* his deity, is preserved to this date in the Vaishnava temples of Bombay. On festive occasions, beautiful *Artis,* full of pearls and colours are drawn by the ladies in the shrines. These *Artis* were originally drawn by the ladies of Vithaleshji's family. During the spring season, the curtains with pictures beautifully drawn in dried and wet colours are still a characteristic feature of the paintings, indicative of the use of art in the service of God. Similarly, the *Sangis* also constitute a feature of divine service in the Vaishnava shrines during a particular season. Though art in this school is essentially religious Vallabhacharya does not exclude moral life from the religious. According to him, religious life implies moral. It is not opposed to morality. The pictures of Krishna's *lilas* evoke love in the heart of a devotee for Him. While he beholds them; his soul feels that it is in the presence of God. The presentation of Art, on each day, has its specific characteristic according to the occasions of festivals and the seasons.

Music:

Like painting, music is not for self-pleasure or demonstration or appreciation from others. Vitthalesha himself was a great lover of music. He used to sing his own before his deity. At each time of divine service, music of *Kirtans* by Suradas, Kumbhanadas, Parmanaddasa, Govindadasa etc. describing Krishna's various *lilas* is deemed essential. Not only that, but the music for the morning service is not·to be repeated at noon time or evening service. The music selected, fitted the time of service of each day and varied not only according to the days, but also according to the seasons. The matter and the tune both varied. This is a speciality of Vallabhacharya's religion. He was fully aware of the idea that *Rasa* is the soul of poetry, which is variously expressed according to the emotion it involves. Vitthalesha composed some songs in Sanskrit in praise of God and his poet disciples Nandadasa, Govindaswamy, Chitta Swamy and Chaturbhujadasa composed them in the Vraja Bhasa-language. Suradasa and other disciples would sing songs before the deity or the Vaishnavas but not, before non-Vaishnavas. They would not sing even before the princes and the kings under threats or temptations of reward. It is said that one Kumbhanadasa, disciple of Vitthaleshji, by Akbara's order, was conducted before him to sing some music, for, his fame as the best singer had reached Akbar's ears and it made him eager to hear him. Kumbhanadasa was reluctant to go but his men forced him to go with them. When he was taken before Akbar at Sikri, the latter asked him to sing some song. He was reluctant to comply with Akbara's desire but circumstances compelling him, he had to sing a song in which in an direct way he gavė him a taunt for asking him to sing. He said, "I am a devotee of God. I sing only before my God and not before others." Akbar being noble-hearted did not take his reply as an offence, but in appreciation offerd him a reward; but he declined and said, "Oh, emperor, if you are really pleased, do not ask me to sing before you again. My song is only for my God." Similarly Suradasa declined the offer of Akbar to sing something in his praise for which he would get a big reward, but he scorned the reward and scoffed at the very idea of singing for flattery. It is recorded in the life of Govindaswamy, a poet disciple of Vitthaleshaji that, one day Akbar, coming to know of Govindswamy's fame as a singer, desired to listen to his songs. He himself went to *Gokula* where Govindaswamy was staying, and disguising his identity, listened to his music in *Bhairwa raga.* Akbar was much impressed, but Govindswamy learnt that his music was heard by Akbar. He was deeply touched in heart. He was sad because it was heard by a non-Vaishnava. From that day he did not sing before God in that tune.

Dance as an art also finds place in the service of God. Krishna danced with the *Gopis*. So in imitation of Krishna's. Rasalila, some times, performance of the *Rasalila* is enacted on special occasions.

From these, one would know that Vallabhacharya's Pushti Marga appreciates Art as a means for experiencing love for God. Apart from that it has no value. Neither Art for Art's sake, nor Art for morality's sake, but for God's sake is his principle.

Cow-Protection:

The Sect of Vallabhacharya is well known for cow-protection. God Krishna was a great lover of the cows, and Himself used to graze cows in the forest of Brindavana in the company of the cowherd boys. Of all the animals, the cow is considered as the most sacred by Vallabhacharya and his followers. His son Vitthalanatha was honoured with the title of 'Goswamy'—The protector of Cows, by Emperor Akbar. Appreciating his love for the cows, the Emperor issued a special 'firman' (order) allowing the grazing of Vitthaleshji's cows free of tax and prohibiting cow killing in the locality where he was residing. A similar order was issued prohibiting the killing of birds also. The title of 'Goswami' since then, has become hereditary for all the descendants of Vitthaleshji. A noble example of Cow saving from the attack of a lion by his disciple, son of Kumbhanadas has been recorded in the book 'The Stories of Eighty four Vaishnavas'. Although the cow-protection is a very common feature of the Hinduism and the Jainism, it has become a sort of religious sentiment among the the followers of Vallabhacharya. It is tantamount to cow-worship. Every Shrine has a *Gaushala* (a place where the cows are kept and maintained) attached to it. Even in the daily divine service, the cows of metal are considered necessary in place of the living cows. A special day called *Gopashtami*—a day for the cow-worship—is celebrated as a festival day, as a token of cow worship, on the eighth day of the month of Kartika every year. His disciples—Suradasa and others have composed songs in which Krishna's sports and the grazing of the cows have been reverentially described. Shri Harirayji a descendant of Vallabhacharya, has written a beautiful song in Sanskrit entitled "Krishna's love for the cows".

For the benefit of the readers to enable them to understand that Vallabhacharya was an Acharya of liberal views, requiring high standard of behaviour in social and religious life, we shall give heres ome of his thoughts from his Subodhini on various topics.

Fitness of A Spiritual Teacher:

One must have a teacher for getting knowledge. Knowledge is not possible to acquire without a teacher. Learning is not simply studying the books, but mastering knowledge, making knowledge as one's own, through the Grace of God. (Bha. S. 1-7-44). Under the influence of a teacher the pupil will imbibe good or bad qualities of his teacher, therefore a teacher must himself develop good qualities and be free from falsehood, pride, passion, anger and revenge (Bha. S. 1-17-40). A pupil should seek his teacher's grace, but only that teacher who himself seeks God's grace is worthy and fit to be a teacher. For a pupil, service of the teacher is necessary for obtaining knowledge from him. The Teacher's life should be stainless and exemplary. He must be, not only, well versed in the scriptures but should have realised God.

Good men

Compassion, uncommon learning, and thinking are chief virtues of good men. They are free from egoism. (10-4-32-30) They are God-possessed, and they behave in accordance with the inner voice of God in relation to others. They are equal minded to friends, and foes (10-1-58) and they respect the traditions and religious practices of the scriptures (10-2-5). They keep themselves away from distractions hindering meditation of God. Their mind, speech and senses are always directed to God (10-13-2). They have no secret to hide from others. They love all and hate none. They are well wishers of all creatures (10-24-4). They are immune from self-love. Their goal of life is only God. They are sympathetic to the poor and the distressed (12-2-6). Their hearts are pure i.e. free from passion, hatred etc. They are the saints whose minds are not disorganised or distracted by any worldly concerns. They are always calm-minded. (10-11-25) They purify the sinners by their company (11-2-28). They are like the sailors that lead the boats safely through waters to their destination (11-2-29). They never visit the houses of others unless to confer blessings on them (10-8-4). If they visit any persons, they favour the poor (10-10-9).

Truth:

Truth is essence of the knowledge part of the Vedas. It is identical with knowledge. One should speak truth in an inoffensive language. Unpalatable truth should not be uttered. Truth, harmful to others must not be spoken. (2-13-13) Truth is identified with supreme knowledge in the Vedas. It is the supreme vow. A man devoted to truth does not suffer fall or degradation in his life. Truth unites one with God. A lover of truth regards it as the attribute of God. Untruth may be spoken only in an extremely exceptional case when life is in danger 10-4-4) but for one seeking God by the path of devotion, truth is incumbent on him. It is the best means for a religious life.

Speech:

Speech is divine. It is the gift to the lover of God for rendering service to Him. On every occasion one must speak truth only. Speech is an important factor in establishing congenial relationship between one individual and another in the society. It should be tempered with sweetness. It works a magical effect in healing the afflictions of human beings. The speech of a good man reveals the marks of invariability and constancy. Bad words are more destructive than arrows. Pain caused by them cannot be easily healed. The words of the fools, are full of censure, and devoid of wisdom. They should be disregarded like the howlings of the jackals by a lion.

Anxiety:

A devotee who has dedicated his life to God, should not entertain anxiety at any time. God according to the Pushtimarga (path of Grace) will not give worldly status to his devotees. God is the Lord and ruler of all and He will do everything according to His Will for the good of every one. He should attribute every occurrence of his life to the will of God. Even if it happens that one is not on the right path in the service of God, it should not make him anxious. A man, who has dedicated his all to God, either through ignorance or knowledge, has no cause for anxiety. In all matters, he should surrender to God, and be guided by Him, and there will not arise any cause for anxiety. Freedom from all kinds of anxieties inclusive of worldly, spiritual and divine nature is a chief characteristic of a true lover of God.

The State of anxiety indicates the devotee's lack of faith and love for God. The occasions of mental anguish should be taken cheerfully as indicative of God's blessing.

As a social thinker, Vallabhacharya has thought of every problem on its merit intrinsically, in conformity with the spirit of the Hindu Dharma. Social conventions are respected by him on their internal worth of spirituality. He did not believe in economic progress as such, without moral and spiritual progress. He was not a politician or a social reformer. He was a philosopher-cum-religious teacher. His yard--stick for measuring social progress, is spirituality and religiosity, which does not admit of any barriers between a man and a man or one class of people and another class of people. The criterion of real social progress lies in the integration of different communities and in their mutual co-operation, acts of justice, fellow-feeling and service of God. These are necessary for maintaining general equilibrium peace and happiness of social life. He has not considered social philosophy as a separate subject but includes it under the philosophy of God. The world, as the greatest society, is not to be treated separately from God. The world is God's creation and all the souls are His parts. As there is no difference between these and God, the social relations of men belonging to different communities and nations should be honoured as being not man-made but God-made. Each one has some role assigned to him by God to play in God's world. Hence social relations must be based on love only. The reforms needed must be on that consideration. Vallabhacharya thinks that a social man with an ideal of service to humanity at large should be a believer in God. An atheist, with his moral code of behaviour may be a good man, but a theist, whose faith in God is inviolable is better; for he sees God in all his dealings with worldly people. He hesitates to do injustice to any person, by his thought, words, and actions. To him, God is the father of all beings, and men of different nationalities and religious communities are brethren.

A true social worker, if he is a believer in God, will consider the whole world as the Kingdom of God and various beings in it as the flowers of the garden of God. For the Divine life the self-love must undergo transformation by benevolent and just social acts and acquire the character of the universal love which should be further refined and converted into most precious gold of the divine love. Social love is the intermediate stage between the self-love and the divine love. Social service is a step to the attainment of the divine love, which is the peak to be reached by devotion of the Divinity. Mere knowledge of the Sciences of Sociology, Social Philosophy and Ethics can not help social workers in his work of introducing changes in the society for its betterment, unless he is guided by the light of religion, which alone will enlighten him with the knowledge that any service in the cause of society, is the service of God. Even humanism or humanitarianism, destitute of the inner light of theism or belief in God is a failure in its zealous and arduous endeavours to achieve desired social good. The message which Vallabhacharya gives to all servants of Humanity is 'Be good and loving to all men, because they are God's men.'

CHAPTER VII

VALLABHACHARYA AS A MYSTIC

"*Through devotion, he (the devotee) comes to know Me (God), in reality, what I am and who I am; and thereby knowing Me in essence, he forthwith enters into Me.*"

THE GITA–XVIII-55

"*Religious discourses, intellectual knowledge, or prodigious learning cannot help one in experiencing God. It is God's grace alone by which God reveals His form to the devotee.*

KATHOPANISHAD 1-2-23.

In this chapter, we shall deal with the Mysticism of the Vaishnavite School of Vallabhacharya, being a branch of the Hindu Religion, Vallabhacharya's school of Religion, represents the mysticism of the Hindu Religion, in consonance with the feature of the devotional element in that school. The school believes in the personal God—God who is Love and Bliss. The aim of Vallabhacharya's mysticism is to experience God physically or mentally by the devotee through devotion.

Mysticism is a common feature almost in all theistic religigions. The Hindu Religion has different ways of mysticisms such as the sacrificial type of the Vedas, the knowledge type of the Upanishads, the Yoga type, and the devotional type of the Pancha ratra and the Bhagavata type. Vallabhacharya's mysticism is based upon the Bhagavata, which emphasises on devotion and selfless love for God as the adequate way for experiencing God.

Mysticism is not an intellectual grasp of Reality nor is it concerned with the world. It is the way of transcending this world and establishing soul's contact with God.

The word 'mystic' is defined in dictionary as 'occult, esoteric, mysterious and awe-inspiring'. Hence a mystic is one who seeks by contemplation and self-surrender, union with or absorption into the Deity, or one who believes in spiritual apprehension of truths, incomprehensible by the intellect. As an Acharya, Vallabhacharya preached the philosophical and the religious truths to the aspirants of spiritual life, but for his own life, his ideal was to experience God for himself during life. His life is an unbroken record of mystical experiences. He was a mystic in the sense that he sought union with God by love and self-surrender. His mysticism is derived from the holy books—the Vedas, the Gita, the Brahma Sutra, and the Bhagavata. According to him, real knowledge must direct one to experience or realise God. The value of knowledge lies in being instrumental in God-realisation. The holy scriptures, which reveal truths experienced by the sages intuitively, provided him the key to mysticism. The perusal of these holy books brought home to his mind the most important truth, namely the goal of man's life is God-realisation or union with God. This goal is emphasised by the Upanishads and the Gita.

(1) God is not attained by prodigious learning, intellect, hearing discourses etc. but He is attained only by him, whom God elects for his revelation. (K. U. 1-2)

(2) By God's grace, He is seen by one, who is free from grief. (K. U. 1-2.20)

(3) He whom God chooses to favour God is realised by him. He reveals His form to him alone, and not to one who seeks Him by any other means. (M. U. 2-2-7)

(4) The wise behold him by intuition (*Vijnana*), to them He reveals His Bliss-form and Immortal form. (M. U. 2-2-7)

(5) God is not comprehended either by the eye, by the speech, by penance or by work, but only by His grace. He who possesses purity of spirit, while meditating on Him, beholds Him who is formless.

(6) One who knows Brahman attains It.

(7) God is Truth, Knowledge, and Infinite Bliss. He who knows Him dwelling in the innermost part of his heart enjoys all his desires with God. (T. U. 5)

From the above references, we learn that the highest aim of man's life is attainment of God and that He is to be attained by His grace only, which is possible through intuitive knowledge and devotion. All men cannot have the vision of God; but by God's grace the pure hearted devotees can have it.

The fact of the devotee's having a vision of God is testified by the Gita. (Ch. XI) and the Brahma Sutras (4-1-7 9), and also by innumerable examples from the Bhagavata.

There are philosophers who are of opinion that truth is to be known either by perception, through sense data or by reason. If it is not known by any of these proofs, it is not truth .They do not accept intuitive knowledge which is at the back of all the mystical experiences. The rationalistic thinkers say that mysticism is indicative of an abnormality of mind, almost akin to insanity. Some think that it is a sign of neurosis or hallucination. Some rationalists accept intuition which enables them to discover scientific and philosophical truths. Leonard Wolf rejects mysticism on the following grounds:

(1) Mysticism and mystics have always risen in times of intellectual decadence.

(2) Spiritual experience cannot be taken as truth, unless it is just, as the presence of a chair in the next room can be proved by showing it.

(3) It is irrational.

(4) The plea of intuition is only a cover for the inability to explain by reason.

Sri Aravinda has very ably refuted these arguments. ('Letters of Shri Aurobindo', p. 349)

Argument No. 1. is unacceptable. The ages in which mystics flourished were not the ages of decadence. We learn from the history of Italy, Greece, France and Spain in the West, and of India in the East that the ages in which their great mystics lived and flourished were not decadent or backward in knowledge. They also had made sufficient progress in various branches of knowledge viz. Philosophy, Mathematics, Art, Music, Astronomy etc. There were great personalities in those ages endowed with uncommon intellectual powers.

Argument no. 2. is the result of superficial thinking. The writer relies upon the knowledge by perception only, but he forgets that there are other categories of knowledge. Every type of knowledge is not demonstrable. Again if knowledge by perception represents truth, then, how is it that the object is not recognised in the same way by different persons who perceive it?

How is it that a rope is mistaken for a snake? In that case an object seen by one man must appear in the same form to another. Our eyes show that the sun is moving but the scientists deny it. At night we do not perceive the sun, but that does not mean that the sun is non-existent. It is perceived in the morning. A man who is a descendent of his twentieth forefather is unable to prove it by the method of perception. The same object under glass of perception is seen variously. So perception is not the only criterion for the validity of truth or knowledge.

Argument no. 3 is inadmissible. The mystical knowledge is not conceptional or rational. It is intuitive. It is not obtained by intellect or reason, but by the inward faculty of intuition. The knowledge by intellect is *Jnana*, but the knowledge by intuition is *Vijnana*. Intellect touches only the outer-fringe of an object but intuition reveals its inner heart. Intellect is analytical, intuition is synthetical. Intellect knows the object by its parts, intuition as a whole. Intellect does not give that immediate, intimate and detailed insight into an object or a truth, which intuition invariably does. Intuitive knowledge is knowledge by identity, wherein you know an object by becoming one with it. Intellectual truths are circumscribed by time and space, they are the truths of the phenomenal world. Intuitive truths are transcendental, belonging to the noumenon. Intellectual knowledge is dependent upon external facts, intuitive knowledge arises within one's own mind and is not dependent upon the external facts. It may arise at any time and in any place. For intellectual knowledge the mind collects the materials with the co-operation of the organs of knowledge and puts them before intellect or reason, which marshals all the facts, eliminates irrelevant facts and chooses those that are necessary. In intuitive knowledge there is no such process. It arises in the twinkling of an eye in a God-inspired moment. When the truth comes, it comes wiht the suddenness of a lightning with the brilliancy and light. Thus, the intuitive truth of mystics is of different character from the intellectual truth.

Argument no. 4 is too weak to be refuted. It is foolish to describe what by nature is indescribable. Dr. Radhakrishnan has examined the question of mysticism thoroughly in his book, entitled 'An Idealist View of Life'. Speaking about mystical experience he says that direct apprehension of God seems to be as real to some men, as the consciousness of personality or the perception of the external world is to others.

Mystical experience is personal, integral and indivisible. It is self-established, self-evident and self-luminous. It is beyond the bounds of proof. It has pure comprehension, entire significance and complete validity. It occurs at rare moments and possesses the character of revelation. We cannot have it at our will. It has intrinsic validity. It is revealed in the state of contemplation. The truth of a mystic is seen by the soul and not by the eyes. There is a feeling of certitude in it. It is ineffable and transcends expression. Such is the nature of mystical experience. It is of many kinds. The saints and the seers believe that they are due to the grace of God. They believe that their life is guided by God who speaks to them, commands them, comforts them. Dr. Radhakrishnan characterises it as intuitive knowledge and differentiates it from intellectual knowledge. Without this, no truths of philosophy or science can be discovered. Poetry will be impossible without it and the contribution to art will be nil. Even Western philosophers, who make much of intellect have admitted the role of intuitive knowledge. Plato admits it, when he says that objects are copies of the ideas, Spinoza, when he says that there is only one substance without differentiation of mind and matter, Locke, when he says that an object like a table has no existence apart from mind, and ultimately from God. Leibniz was a monologist, but, for the sake of his doctrine of Pre-established harmony, he had to admit God as a Supermonad. Kant discredits sense-knowledge and reason for the comprehension of Reality, but resorts to intuition. Hegal falters on a slippery ground by being very enthusiastic for intellect. Bergson sees the futility of intellect and rejects it in favour of intuition for the comprehension of Reality. Thus we see that even the Western philosophers, much against their will, have been driven to lend support to in tuition indirectly.

The Eastern philosophers—Buddha, Mahavira, Kapila Gautama, Jaimini, Badarayana, Shankara, Ramanuja, Madhav Bhaskara, Nimbarka, Sri Kantha, Vallabhacharya, Chaitanya, Rabindranath Tagore, and Sri Aurobindo were all mystics, though their ways of God-realisation were different. Whatever truths they have preached were revealed to them by God. They were inward truths, experienced in quiet moments, when their minds were in tune with God.

Writing on the mystical nature of Reality, Dr. Ranade, in his book on Bhagavad Gita (p. 162), lays down three points: (1) as the greatest miracle (XI-19) (2) the absolute limitation of human knowledge in respect of the knowledge of God, (VII-26), (3) The knowledge of God by Himself alone (XI-5). The same writer mentions three criteria from the Gita for God-realisation: (1) Super-sensuousness, (2) intuition and (3) central initiation. All the experiences of a mystic, such as (1) seeing things, hearing sounds, enjoying smells are not drawn from the outside world, but from within (2) Beatification (3) Permanence or continuity.

The seekers of God, have six categories—(1) The unrepentant sinners, (2) (a) Miserable persons, and (b) Men afraid of old age and death, (3) The end-seekers of worldy objects who want particular desires to be fulfilled (4) Repentant sinners (5) The intellectual seekers (6) Those who have reached the end of spiritual life. The path of God-realisation is as difficult as walking on the edge of a razor. It is a question of time. It requires constant spiritual practices and lastly it depends upon the grace of God.

Dr. Ranade indicates various methods for experiencing God, viz. the Ideological method, Moral method, mystical method including the method of Ashtanga Yoga, worship and Devotion. He adds to this the element of God's grace. (X-10-11, XVIII-62)

God's grace has three stages, first, that of the *Buddhi Yoga*, second that of God's compassion upon him and, lastly that of feeling ecstacy of God-realisation.

God can be experienced in internal consciousness and in the external world also. But the aspirant must establish moral and axiological relationship with God. Among the effects of God-vision, Dr. Ranade mentions (1) Joy and peace, (2) Disgust for worldy things, (3) singleness originating from true devotion, (4) warding off all perils, (5) solution of world riddle, (6) vision of equality and (7) community of saints.

Evelyn Underhill, a prominent writer on Mysticism recognises the validity of mystical experience, but he lays down following rules as tests of Mystical experience.

(1) It is practical and not theoretical. It is not mere thinking, but a practical way of experiencing God, through prayers, worship or some devotional acts.

(2) It is entirely spiritual activity not directed to worldly gains. It is never self-seeking.

(3) Its aim and method is God's love.

(4) It entails a definite psychological experience.

Vallabhacharya's theory of mysticism is derived from the scriptures. It reveals all the above points.

To acquire fitness for the mystical experience of God's revelation to the devotee, the Gita lays stress upon the cultivation of the divine virtues, which are dependent firstly upon the renunciattion of prohibited acts or demonical qualities as mentioned in Ch. XVI, and then turning all one's acts Godwards. which is possible only from renunciation of all kinds of attachment to the worldy objects and refraining from worldly relations interrupting his progress of God's love. Vallabhacharya's ideal is that of the Gita, in the preliminary stage, that of Gopi-love Bhagavata in course of its development.

Vallabhacharya believes in the devotional method with an element of God's grace, for the realisation of God. The devotional method includes (1) the nine-fold type of devotion, i.e. listening to the accounts of God's deeds, remembering Him, reciting God's glories, falling prostrate before the image of God worshipping and serving Him, establishing friendly relation and companionship with God and consecrating all one's own to Him, (2) prayers and hymns including fasts and vows, (3) employment of body and wealth in service of God, (4) experiencing pangs of separation from God, and (5) Japa or repeating silently the holy mantra—"Lord Krishna is my refuge." These are the chief modes, of mystical experiences corresponding to the level of development of each aspirant. Vallabha divides the souls into three categories, (1) The divine souls (2) The spiritual souls and (3) The worldly souls. The first type is the highest and the path of devotion is intended only for these souls. These have also four sub-types: (1) Pure souls or the transcendental souls (2) They are no doubt in the world, but not worldly. They are fully divine. They seek only God's love and His Grace. (3) The love of God is predominant in them, still it is mixed with trust in the scripture. They are a blend of divinity and spirituality (4) Those souls have love for God but they do not forget their attachment to the world. These four types of souls may experience God according to any of the above modes of the devotional method. It is not to be used for fulfilment of one's selfish desires.

There are various forms by which God reveals Himself to a mystic. They are by (1) hearing God's voice, (2) divine help at the critical time or in an emergency, (3) control over natural phenomena, (4) checking of the evil forces or supernatural elements, (5) the cure of the invalids, (6) the blessings and message for future guidance from supernatural powers and (7) the visions of God.

Vallabhacharya's life is full of instances of the above. These instances are noted in the works, named, '*Nija Varta*', '*Gharu Varta* and '*The Stories of 84 Vaishnavas*'. To the scientific mind, they may not appear as authentic, but judged in the light of Dr. Radhakrishnan's explanation, they are perfectly authentic. Even James, the psychologist of the pragmatic school would accept validity of religious experiences. He writes in his "Varieties of Religious experience," "The overcoming of all the usual barriers between the individual and the Absolute is the great mystic achievement. In mystic states, we become one with the Absolute and aware of our oneness. This is the everlasting and triumphant mystic tradition, hardly altered by differences of caste and creed. In Hinduism, Neoplatonism, Suffism, Christian Mysticism and Whitemanism, we have the same recurring note that there is about mystical recurrences, an eternal unanimity which sought to make a critic stop and think."

In the early life of Vallabhacharya, God appeared before him in person and commanded him to initiate souls in his path of devotion. This was the first occasion of hearing God's voice.

It was the voice of God that made him attend the religious conference at the court of the King of Vijayanagar where he participated in the debate and was triumphant. This voice was nothing but his intuitive knowledge, which guided him even in crucial moments. His tours throughout India and his marriage were due to the urge from within, on account of God's will. He had full faith in God and believed that God's Will functioned in all matters. He heard divine voices at *Gangasagar* and at *Madhuvan* commanding him to give up preach ing and literary activities and renounce the world.

We shall cite some examples to understand the nature of his mystical experiences.

Once when he was at Adel, Vallabhacharya's wife Mahalaxmi was on the other side of the river Yamuna and her immediate presence was required at Adel. It was the beginning of the night and all had retired to bed. Vallabhacharya called Padmanabha one of his followers, and asked him to go to the opposite bank and bring her there. Padmanabha, obeying his order, went towards the bank of the river. As there was darkness all around, and he could not see any boatman there he was puzzled, not knowing what to do, he returned to Vallabhacharya to tell him that there was neither a boat, nor a boatman. Vallabha asked him to go again, and told him that he would see there a boatman with a boat. Padmanabha went again and to his suprise he saw one figure in the form of a boatman standing in the boat and asking him to take his seat in the boat. Padmanabha happily took his seat in the boat and reached the opposite shore, saw Vallabhacharya's wife and delivered his message and both returned in the same boat. Padmanabha narrated his experience to the Acharya. He smiled and said, "I knew it. It was God's Will. If you go to the bank now, you will see neither the boat nor that boatman."

One Lohana young boy, named Narayanadasa, a son of a wealthy man living at Thaththa in Sindh, was suffering from leprosy. His father consulted many expert physicians, but all medicines proved ineffective. When he heard about the arrival of Acharyashri at Thaththa, he took his son to him for his blessing. He fell prostrate at the foot of Acharyashi and acquainted him of the disease of his son and requested him to bless him by curing his disease. He put some money at the feet of Acharyashri as present. Acharyashri simply said, "I am not a physician. A mans' life is in the hands of God. God alone can cure incurable diseases. Pray to God. He is merciful, and will cure your son if He so wills. You give money to me as a bribe. I do not touch money. Take it away." With these words, he blessed Narayanadasa by putting his hand on his head and passing it over his body. He also touched his body with his holy feet. Narayana's father took the son home, and to his great surprise, he found that leprosy had completely disappeared from his body. The father and all the members of the family were very ahppy. Next day, both of them went to Acharyashri to report the matter. The father said, "By your blessings, my son's disease is gone. We are very grateful to you." Acharyashi simply said, "That is God's will. One does not know how the Divine Will works." Requested by Narayanadasa, he initiated him into his faith, and exhorted him to devote his time to the service of God. This Narayanadasa afterwards occupied a responsible post of a minister to the ruler of Sindh and was an ideal devotee. It has been recorded in the life of Madhavabhatta a Kashmiri Pandit and Acharyashri's scribe that he made alive the dead son of a rich man, at his request, by a prayer to God and Acharyashri's grace.

It was his faith in God's power that Acharyashri silenced his opponents, at Benaras, by his work '*Patravalambana*'. Acharyashri's victory over his rivals at Jagannath Puri, regarding authenticity of the Bhagavad Gita was God's declaration. His opinion was accepted by the image of God Jagannathaji. The paper on which the opinion was written, was put into a big blaze, for testing its validity, but it survived it unburnt.

When one day Acharyashi was giving his discourse on the Bhagavata to his audience at Shamkhoddhara, clouds appeared in the sky, threatening to rain, but Acharyashri, uttered his holy mantra, and it rained heavily in the neighbourhood, but not a drop where the audience had gathered for listening to his religious discourse.

When Acharyashri was staying at the *Vishram Ghata* in Mathura some muslims created disturbance. A panic spread among the Hindus, that the muslims had hung a charm there, which, if any Hindu passed under it, would deprive him of his tuft of hair on the head. To allay the excitement, Acharyashri wrote his favourite mantra on a piece of paper and suspended it, at the gate of the city of Delhi, which made a Muslim ,passing under it, beardless. Acharyashri's *Mantra* stirred excitement among the members of the muslim community. The matter reached the ears of the emperor who commanded the Muslim charm to be withdrawn at Delhi and Acharyashri also withdrew his mantra, and soon peace was restored. At Ujjain he planted a leaf of the Pipal tree in the earth and poured water over it, uttering the Mantra, and a tree sprang from it the next morning.

At Bahulavana, some Muslims interferred with the cow-worship, but he removed the opposition by divine power.

At Kamavana near the *Surabhi Kunda,* he heard a report about the presence of a Brahmin evil spirit. At the request of the people, he poured water of his dhotar (a cloth) on the tree where it was supposed to reside and the evil spirit disappeared.

Narhara Joshi of Kheralu in Gujarat extinguished a big fire in the house of Mahidhara and Fulbai at Alina (Story No. 31) simply by uttering Acharyashri's name and the holy Mantra.

One Janardandasa came by a gold coin on the way. He was advised that it was not worth keeping for himself. He therefore presented the same to Acharyashri. Although he had not mentioned the circumstances, Acharyashri remarked, "You want to present to me the gold coin found by you on the way. Well, take it back. It is a sin for me to touch it and a sin for you to keep it with you, because it is not earned honestly by the sweat of your brow. Better give it to some poor Brahmin." Janardan acted according to his advice and later on received God's blessings.

Kanaiyalal a staunch adherent of Acharyashri was enamoured of Acharyashri's literature. He being his favourite pupil, Acharyashri allowed him free access to all his works and also himself taught him his works. It is said that one day, while reading the Subodhini on the Bhagavata describing to the separation of the *Gopis* from Krishna he became unconscious for several hours. Acharyashri coming to know it appeared on the spot, and sprinkled water on him and brought him to consciousness.

Virabai, the mother of Damodardas was robbed of her money by the thieves. Acharyashri pointed out the place where it was concealed and the money was restored to her.

One Gopaldasa Kshatriya was looted on his way to Kashi. The matter was brought to the notice of Acharyashri, who read his past and said to him, "This is the fruit of your action. Ten years back you caught hold of one thief running away with the article of theft, and now he pays you in the same coin. So, it is a law of karma, as we sow, so we reap."

One Ramananda Pandit, a great scholar had mastery over all the scriptures. He was very proud of his learning. One day he appeared before Acharyashri with a view to engaging him in a dispute on a philosophical subject and defeating him. Acharyashri at once read his mind, offered him a seat courteously and asked him to begin his discussion on any matter he liked, but he was so much constrained that inspite of his best of efforts, he could not utter a single word for some time. Realising his folly in engaging Acharyashri in a dispute, he fell prostrate at his feet, and became his disciple.

Bhagavanadasa was an illiterate person. He desired to know the truth of devotional life. A request was made to Acharyashri who explained it briefly in his small work called "*Chatushloki*", and Bhagavandasa knew the whole truth of devotional life. Without the knowledge of the scriptures he knew, by Acharyashri's grace, all that was necessary for a devotee.

Acharyashri, while blessing the mother of Jagannath Joshi of Kheralu made prophetic utterances that she would have two sons, who would be ideal Vaishnavas, and that her husband living a wicked life, would die within five years. Both these prophecies came true.

The wife of one Krishnadasa, while digging the earth got buried under a heap of earth falling overhead. The body was taken out but there was no hope of her survival. Acharyashri sprinkled water over her with a mantra and she was restored to life.

One Narayana, a bard by caste, appeared before Acharyashri and told him his grievance, "I am a bard by caste. Our people live by composing verses in praise of our clients, but I have not learnt it. I cannot compose verses and earn money." Acharyashri said, "It is God's will that you have no money. It is good that you do not know how to compose verses, otherwise, you would have misused your talent in eulogising worldly people for the sake of money. Art and Poetry must be used in the service of God only. God does not wish you to use it for earning money. You should thank God that you are poor and have no poetic talents. You will however see heaps of money, but beware of the snares of money. It is a great temptation which allures men to destruction." Next day, when Narayana went to the river Yamuna for a bath, he saw heaps of money sparkling in the water. His eyes fell on them and he was tempted to take money, but soon two black-faced and ugly-looking bearded persons with big clues appeared before him and he was forced to give up the attempt. Then he went to Acharyashri, as usual, to pay his respects and narrated his experience. Acharyashri smiled and simply remarked, "You have known by personal experience the futility of seeking money. So, henceforth, do not be uneasy about your livelihood. Have faith in God and he will keep you free from it." He accepted the advice of Acharyashri and gave up hankering after money.

These are some of the incidents illustrative of the mystical experiences and powers of Acharyashri; yet personally he did not believe in miracles or magical feats. For him, the purpose of life was to have the vision of God. That was the innermost desire of his heart, but in obedience to the voices heard by him, he accepted married life and started activities of writing and preaching, simply for liberation of the devotional souls. When he felt intuitively that he should give up those activities he gave them up and spent the last days of his life in experiencing God's bliss only. The end of mysticism according to him, as stated above, is achieving union with God and participating in His Bliss through His Grace. He no doubt, performed some miracles such as controlling natural powers, checking the powers of evil spirits, curing the diseases, etc., but his real purpose was God-realisation. The miracles were due to God's Grace, which he did on His behalf.

People of the modern age may believe in miracles or not, but they are possible in the case of religious minded and pure-hearted people. Lord Tennyson believed in the power of the prayers, when he said in his "Morte de Arthur".

More things are wrought by prayer
Than this world dreams of.

The Gita also says, "All difficulties are surmounted by the Grace of God." Acharyashri's *mantra* is nothing but a formula of evoking grace of God.

Prof. C. E. M. Joad has discussed the question of the validity of mystical experiences by the religious teachers in his book

'Good and Evil.' He lends support to the validity—hypothesis. Prof. Alduous Huxley also supports it in his 'Ends and Means', but he distinguished between experiences of the impersonal God (Consciousness) and personal God and discredits the latter. Prof. Joad examines Huxley's views and points out logical difficulties in accepting Huxley's theory. If universal consciousness (God) is impersonal, then He is devoid of any motive or will, for personality implies motive or will also. If God is motiveless what is His motive in creating the world and also evil in it? Again if God is not personal, how can individual souls satisfy their desires from God in the mystical way? If God is not personal, He would not reveal Himself to the soul and fulfil his desires for knowledge, liberation, or service to humanity. So one must suppose that God has motive and will. In the experience of the Universal Consciousness, the individual soul has no separate existence, it is merged into it and so there is no one to be experienced and no one to experience it. The subject-object-relation is completely gone.. The object is merged into the subject. In that state, there is no consciousness on the part of the person having experience, that he has got an experience. So logically this hypothesis does not stand. Prof. Joad believes that in accepting mystical experience of a Personal God, no logical difficulty of the above kind will arise. The chief characteristics of this experience are integration, sense of release, continuity and conviction of reality. By integration the soul always believes itself in union with God. For a mystical experience the state of union must be achieved by going through necessary discipline in the form of purity, control of mind, development of moral character and concentrating mind only on God. The next is the sense of release, a kind of feeling by which the soul feels free from all attractions except that of God. This is not a temporary state. It is a permanent state and with the passing of time, it becomes deeper and intenser. Lastly, there is a feeling, which is most important namely, conviction of the reality of God. These are some of the characteristic features in the mystical experience of a personal God.

Again, what is to be understood by experiencing personal God? According to Joad, it is a private experience belonging only to the person experiencing. It is private and is neither to be communicated to others, nor does it require to be explained, for its nature is inexplicable. He says, "To experience God, one must practise God's qualities in his life. God is described as Truth, Goodness and Beauty. When one speaks truth, he understands truth and evaluates it as the supreme quality in all his words and thoughts. It is tantamount to the experiencing of Personal God in His Truth aspect. Similarly, if he understands goodness and practises it in relation with others and evaluates it as supreme, he is said to have experienced God in his Goodness aspect of personality. If he appreciates beauty and evaluates it in thoughts and words in men, animals, the vegetable kingdom and in nature, he is supposed to have experienced the beauty aspect of God's personality." Out of many powers or qualities, when a man singles out one, and focusses his full attention on it and making it a single aim of life, devotes his entire life to it God is sure to bless him with His revelation.

There are various modes for the religious experiences of God such as knowledge, mental discipline, devotion, etc. and there are various relations between an aspirant and God, such as of the father and the son, the master and the servant, the beloved and the lover, etc. but the mode of love by the relation of the beloved and the lover is the best.

Vallabhacharya's mode of experiencing personal God is love in the relation of the beloved and the lover. It was also the mode of the Suffis mystics. To the Hindus, the love of the Gopis for Krishna, portrayed in the 10th book of the Bhagavata is the ideal, one and that was also an ideal of Acharyashri. Suradasa, Dayarama and even Ravindranath Tagore had enjoyed mystical experiences of God, through love for God.

Some psychologists have attempted a naturalistic explanation of mystical states, especially those phases of religious experience which are characterised by the play of the emotions arising out of the union with a personal God, but they have failed in understanding its real nature. The experiences of a mystic are not of the type of the normal man—a man engrossed in world by affairs. A mystic transcends the consciousness, sensory processes and indescribable feelings and enters upon the stage of pure consciousness in which he realises union with a Personal God. Even the religious psychology is inadequate to explain the experience of the mystic in the stage of union with God, because it is the state in which the mystic rises above space and time. In the words of Prof. Radhakamal Mukerjee "Psychology so far may accordingly analyse mystical experiences into complex, affective and intellectual states, but it cannot decide the value of the deeper insights and attitudes of a metaphysical significance. Science and philosophy in all their forms express the unity of the idea, but cannot exhaust the Reality. (The Theory and Art of Mysticism, Page 213).

It may be added here that God, according to Vallabhacharya, is not only pure consciousness but is more than that. He is perfect Reality with Being, Consciousness and Bliss. He is identified with love, which is transcendental love in a personal form.

The nature of *bhakti* in the love-form is not an erotic sentiment, nor is it a sublimated aspect of sex-instinct. The love that springs from sex-instinct is rooted in the desire and requires fulfilment or satisfaction from the object that is loved. When one fails to satisfy it in human relations, it is directed to God by the process called sublimation. The devotee's experience of love of God is not sublimation. It is on a higher plane. It is love for the sake of God's love. It does not seek any reward. It is free from desires. If it is a desire, it is the desire for the enjoyment of God's love and nothing else. It is to be enjoyed in the divine state of the soul attended with complete divinisation of the body, the senses and the mind. They all become divine. First, the soul becomes divine with its bodily equipment and, then, it acquires fitness, to enjoy love with God. In the sublimation process, there is consciousness about the withdrawing of love from a human object and turning to the Divinity, but in the enjoyment of the divine love in union with God, there is no awareness of it. The soul stands on equal footing with God, and enjoys His love. It is not one-sided love but reciprocal and the peculiarity of this love is that God Himself becomes an object of enjoyment by the soul. Vallabhacharya's mysticism is not the mysticism of soul's identification with God (the state of absorption of the individual consciousness into universal consciousness.) In the devotee's experience the soul has its separate existence in the union state. According to Vallabhacharya, God is not static but dynamic and soul's experience of the love of God is with dynamic God. Such an experience is illustrated by the author of Bhagavata, by the love of the Gopis, who by their dedication, renunciation, surrender and supreme love of God were singled out by God for His Grace on them, so that they might enjoy the bliss of a dance with Him. In the beginning, the ideal of love of the devotee is that of a beloved for her lover, but as love grows and reaches its climax, there is no consciousness of that relation. It is so much overpowered with the emotion of joy, that it becomes oblivious of the soul's relation with God. What delights the soul is the aware ness of the restoration of its divinity and the participation in God's bliss. Some persons, mistake the experience of God-realisation by a mystic as abnormality or pathologicality, but the mystics who have realised God were not abnormal, but transformed personalities, or supra-normal persons. The mind of an abnormal man is disintegrated, his emotions disharmonious, his actions incongruous and inconsistent. The mystic's mind attains complete integration and his emotions are fully controlled and his intellect, emotions and will are so co-ordinated that they all function harmoniously in experiencing God. The Hindu mystics were perfectly sound emotionally and intellectually. They were men of great erudition and scholarship. They were much above the average. They were great thinkers. Their lives being religiously well-disciplined, and, emotionally they cultivated fellow-feeling, amiability, compassion and love for all creatures, irrespective of caste, creed and colour. They did not fritter away their mental powers in vain pursuits of worldly things, which are ephemeral, but used them in quest of God, who is to them of permanent value. Vallabhacharya belonged to such a class of the mystics who taught the path of realising or experiencing God by the love-type of devotion. He experienced love of God in all worldly objects and all human relations.

He admonished his disciples to cultivate the highest type of love for God. He says, 'If you desire to be blessed by God's revelation to you, then it is not possible by your efforts, but by His Grace which dispends upon your knowledge and devotion. By knowledge, you should know that all the things that are within your knowledge are expressions of His Divinity. They are His partial manifested forms. So you must love them also as being God's and manifested for God's Lila. Equipped with this knowledge offer devotion to him, in all its forms, and regard Him as present everywhere. You will then feel His presence not only around you, but with you in all your thoughts, emotions, and actions. You will also feel that God has made an abode in your heart and is waiting for a time to reveal Himself to you."

CHAPTER VIII

PHILOSOPHY OF DIVINE LOVE

'Oh, you 'Singers of God's glorious deeds, as you possess the knowledge of God, as the originator of the world, and Supreme Truth pervading all our transactions, may you win in this life, His love, by dedicating your body, senses and mind to Him in all your thoughts, may you recite His glorious deeds, and love Him, and God will bestow His grace on you'.

RIGVEDA (1-156-3)

Shri Vallabhacharya was not only a philosopher but also a religious teacher and a mystic. He did not think that the ends of philosophy and religion were divergent from each other, and, as supposed by some, diametrically opposed to each other. To him, philosophy and religion were not twin sisters, at least the former was a handmaid of the latter. Both philosophy and religion are the approaches to Reality, i.e. God, the former through thinking, and the latter through feeling. Philosophy is not merely intellectual, metaphysical or logical knowledge. It is not an abstract science. It has, like other sciences, direct bearing on life. It endeavours to comprehend the nature of the Ultimate Reality. Religion following the track of philosophy endeavours to feel the Reality. The first one is theoretical, the second practical. Both have as their aim—the attainment of the ultimate Reality, i.e. God. If a spiritual aspirant wants to realise God, he must know the nature of God first and then feel Him. God-realisation means experiencing God in His personal form. This process of experience involves, thinking and feeling for God. Thinking means knowing God and feeling means loving Him. Wherever one feels for any object, there is thinking at its back. These two processes in the beginning are simultaneous, but later on the thinking process sinks into feeling process. So in the totality of experience it is the experience by feeling only, known as love. The feeling of love is latent as a germ in the thinking process. According to Vallabhacharya knowledge and love for God should co-operate with each other in this experience. The end of philosophy and religion is not simply "to investigate into the why and wherefore of things or to grasp the sum total of things and understand the good of it all, or to interpret them, but to realise God, pervading them all. Philosophy has to bring home to the mind of a spiritual seeker, the truth that there is ultimate Reality called God, pervading all phenomena and events. Religion, with this basic knowledge tends to realise God, not by thought only, but by the feeling process of love or *Bhakti.*

Experiencing or realising God is tantamount to knowing and loving God simultaneously or only loving God in the higher stage of that experience. This means that to love God, one must know God and vice versa. When knowing gets merged in loving, it is only loving. This love acquires a new name of Divine Love, for, it is not love for any earthly object.

One may contend that there are some religions which do not accept God. There are some systems which do not think it necessary to bother about God. Charvaka was an atheist. Buddhism taught purity of moral life, instead of belief in God ,though the followers of Buddhism have raised Buddha to the position of God. Jainism accepts God only as a judge of human actions and not as a creator. The Samkhya School believes in Prakriti or nature as ultimate reality. The *Yoga* system accepts God only for the purpose of meditation, and not as a creator. The Nyaya Vaishasika Schools have proved existence of God by logic,—but He is only an efficient cause, not a material cause of the world. The *Purva Mimansa* substitutes 'sacrifice' in place of God. The *Uttara Mimansa* accepts God i.e. *Brahman* as ultimate Reality, both as a material and efficient cause, and makes Its attainment the chief goal for a spiritual aspirant. Shamkaracharya accepts God, but to him, God is impersonal-absolute. Ramanuja, Madhva, Nimbarka Islam and Zoroastrianism are theistic religions with deep faith in God though their conception of God differs from that of the Hinduism. The religions that deny God's existence are not hostile to God. They value moral life in worldly relations more than religious life. They think that it is not necessary to direct men to look to God or the other world. They thought that, men must live this life well planned, well-ordered and noble, worthy of an ideal man of the world. Although *Dharma, Artha, Kama & Moksha* have been mentiond in the scriptures as ends of human pursuits, happiness is the chief one. *Dharma* is righteous conduct, *Artha* is wealth, *Kama* satisfaction of desires and *Moksha* liberation. The first two are only means, to the third and the fourth ends. By wealth one fulfils one's desires, and by right conduct one gets liberation, but the underlying motive behind *Kama* and the *Moksha* is release from miseries and securing happiness. The worldly persons seek happiness in the satisfaction of their desires, and the spiritual aspirants in liberation. So, ultimately, it is the happiness which is the chief end of life, though the idea of happiness varies with different persons. There are different opinions regarding happiness. The materialists' happiness consists in having worldly enjoyments. The agnostics are doubtful about the existence of a happy state anywhere in worldly life.

One's idea of a happy state is determined by one's intellect. The term happiness is very vague. It is indefinable. Each individual has his own point of view about it. It is therefore relative. The happy state of one person is not the happy state of another. A man will estimate his happy state by the light of his intellect, which is organically constituted of the three qualities of his nature —Satva, Rajas and Tamas. Some men's intellect is Sattvika, having predominance of Sattva; of some it is Rajas, having predominance of Rajas, and of some, it is Tamas, having predominance of Tamas. As the intellect of the majority of men being under the impact of Tamas, they are ignorant of the real nature of happiness. The men of Rajas intellect hanker after happiness to be got from possession of worldly things viz. health, wealth, fame, etc.; but in the end despite their toil, sweat and tears in pursuit of them, they undergo discomfiture and disappointment.

The possession of the worldly things leads them nowhere. They repent in after life, and admit that they frittered away golden opportunities of life for nothing which is of permanent character. Superior to these men, there are men whose intellect is *Sattvika*, which is sufficiently developed by the knowledge of the holy books, so that they are able to discriminate between true happiness and false. False happiness is like hoping to quench thirst from waters of a mirage in the desert. True happiness does not depend upon external objects but it is to be derived from within, and gives repose and calm, making a man internally happy. Only those whose intellect is *Sattvika* may hope to get such happiness.

Many people go mad after wealth, hoping, it will make them happy in life, but in the end it proves treacherous. If wealth is earned by right and honest means, it may conduce to some happiness, but most of the wealth is frivolous and unstable. Saintly persons will not throw away the golden opportunities of their lives in getting wealth. Hankering after wealth is a vanity fair, a cheat in the end.

Power is supposed by some persons as a source of happiness, but it is a wrong notion. Power isolates men from other people, intoxicates its possessor and creates enmity among friends. Again it is not got easily. One has to practise fraud and intrigues and to stoop so low as to forget relationship and even murder his kith and kin. There is no surfeit in it. One who possesses power, wants to get more and more power. He resorts to unfair means, and goes to the length of exercising tyranny over others to stabilise his power. A man of power has no friends, he lives in his own narrow empire, and builds a tower of strength for his protection, but when fortune frowns upon him, the tower topples down and, not only that it does not afford protection, but makes him a butt of ridicule of the whole world. King Alexander brought under his sway many parts of Asia and Europe. But when he was on death-bed he instructed his officers to keep both his hands uncovered while carrying his piar for death-ceremony, so as to impress upon the public the futility of earthly power.

Fame also is subject to the same criticism. Many men xamire persons for their good actions, social service, patriotism etc. but fame fills a man's mind with pride. It makes him arrogant and impudent. It is shortlived and does not survive his death. Very often it proves treacherous, a mere flattery to fawning voice.

Also wealth, power and fame which have been prized most valuable for a happy life, are hollow in the end. They are like edifices standing on the sands. Their foundation is weak. Let us then turn to the question viz. wherein does lie true happiness? Before we discuss it, let us mention some of the characteristics of true happiness.

(1) True happiness is only internal. It is the result of the purity of heart, and knowledge and love of God.

(2) It is deep and bottomless in intensity.

(3) It is not ephemeral like other earthly things; but it is a divine gift for all time.

(4) It is not subject to changes, but it is constant in its quality.

(5) It does not become old, worn out and stale with march of time. On the contrary, it becomes more fresh and blooming, its beauty and flavour being perennial. It is a heavenly plant free from the impact of time. The bird of time flies round it but cannot marits beauty.

(6) It is unruffled and pure under all states of life.

(7) It seeks, as its goal, the happiness accruing from soul's union with God.

(8) It is free and unencumbered by any social codes or traditions, ethical standards and political situations.

Material possessions, power, fame, social service, pursuit of moral life, love of truth and knowledge and art have, no doubt, been regarded as sources of happiness, but to Vallabhacharya, attainment of God's Blissful Form, is the real happiness.

The material possessions may conduce us to happiness, if they are taken as God's gifts, not for one's use but for their use in God's service. To get happiness, we must love God and not the material objects, unrelated to God. Unless our things are related to God, they would not make us really happy. In worldly life, we forget this, and regard ourselves as sole possessors of our things meant for our own personal use and consequently, they become a source of unhappiness to us. So to get happiness from material things and from all our worldly connections, we should think of them in relation to God. This means that they should be used in God's service, and as such should become instruments in experiencing God.

Some persons measure the worth of happiness by a yard-stick of an individual's self-love. Really speaking, the individual self-love is a part of God. It is the emanation of God. It cannot have existence apart from God. If one loves one's self alone, one can not get real happiness. It is deceptive and is the cause of a man's degradation. It keeps the soul away from God, but if the self-love is transferred to God, it is noble, and is a means of true happiness. The seekers of God should transcend self-love and make God's love as their goal of true happiness. It is not easy to get such love without renunciation of the worldly objects. One must know the stumbling blocks such as immoderation in diet, scepticism, want of regularity, publicity, sophistry, desires for worldly objects, want of continence, undersirable company etc. One has to make one's life spiritual before one deserves God's grace. He should note the following contributory factors to spiritual advancement.

(1) Firm determination for living a spiritual life. (2) Ceaseless effort for spirituality. (3) Faith in God. (4) Pious Conduct. (5) Sinlessness. (6) Cultivation of divine virtues mentioned in the 16th chapter of Gita. (7) Single-mindedness in devotion, (8) Prayers, (9) Humiliation and freedom from egoism and passions. (10) Complete detachment from the world. (13) Yearning for God's love.

Of all earthly loves, self-love is supposed to be the chief love, because, all other loves converge to and merge in self-love. People love others, because they love themselves. The self-love however, should not be mistaken for an egoistic love. Those, who restrict the sense of the 'self' to the ego, have not realised the true nature of the 'self'. Each 'self' is a small fragment of the greatest 'Self' (God). The greatest self–God–is like the sun, which diffuses its light through its innumerable rays. The individual selves are the rays of the sun of God. They emanate from God. Really speaking Self-love means love for God, because 'self' means 'God', though it is used for an individual soul. Love for One's own-self is the lowest form of love, but by sublimation it can rise to the higher form of social love, allruistic love, universal love and finally divine love.

Some psychologists in the West have thought of self-love as a chief contributory factor in the development of one's personality. Freud equates it with sex-love and Libido-Adler confounds it with power and Jung identifies it with Will. These psychologists focus their attention only on the mind, but they have not known that there is a principle called 'soul' which is higher than that and that there is still the highest principle, God. They have explained only the physical side of life dominated by mind and have ignored its spiritual side. They neither recognise soul, nor God, for explaining functions of the mind. They cannot help us much in understanding the real problem of happiness. The Hindus regard self-love as the love for Self i.e. God. The individual selves are only the partial manifestation of God's consciousness. So what is called

'Self' is not to be understood as love to oneself but love directed to God.

From individual self-love, a devotee of God rises to the plane of the Divine Love, by the process of its transmutation through knowledge and devotion.

The divine love is distinguished from temporal loves by the following marks.

(1) It is unparalleled and unequalled by earthly love. (2) It is free from vulgarity and sexuality (3) It is constant. (4) It is undeterred by extraneous difficulties and obstacles. (5) It is not dependent upon external conditions and is spontaneous. (6) It is unshakable like a rock and violent in velocity like the waters of the Ganges, falling from the Himalayas. (7) It is sacred and unsullied by baseness of worldly considerations. (8) It is directed to God single mindedly. (9) It is disinterested. (10) It is transcendental and has nothing to do with worldliness. (11) Its end is perfect love in union with God. (12) It is fearless. (13) It believes in giving without consideration of reciprocity. (14) It is never stagnant. It is dynamic, progressing day to day, till its culmination into perfect form of the Divine Love.

The Divine love, whose goal is God-realisation and participation in the Bliss of God, has two types:

(1) The type of conjugal love of the bride and the bridegroom and

(2) The type of the love of the beloved persons.

Christianity has first type, the Suffism and Vaisnavism the second type. The only difference between the Suffist love and the Vaishnavite love is that the Suffists express their love to God believing Him as a Masuka (Mistress) and the devotees as Asaka (male lovers) and the Vaishnavas love God (Krishna) as a male-Asaka, the devotees being females or the Gopis (Masuka). The Vaisnavite conception of the Divine Love is derived from the Bhagavata, which makes the love of the Gopis—the ideal of the Divine Love. By this love or the Divine Love the devotees participate in divine bliss and enjoy dalliance with God. The author of the Bhagavata and subsequently the poets like Jayadeva, Narsinha, Suradas and Dayarama have described this love in many songs. Some people miscall it as an erotic love. but It is perfectly Divine, without the slightest tinge of sexuality, though described in the language of human love. Whether it is the love of the first type of the bride and bridegroom or of the second type, of the beloved, it is transcendental and divine. St. Bernard, referring to the first type observes, 'The love of God and of the soul can be expressed in no way so perfectly as by the mutual love of a bride and a bridegroom. A Fleming writer Raysbroek calls it spiritual nuptial. Among modern writers, Coventry Patmore describes the relationship between the soul and God as that of the bride and bridegroom. This is the Christian view of the Divine love. The Hindus have preferred the love of the beloved persons to that of the bride and bridegroom, because it is superior to the first which very often loses its fire. The husband and wife are ever in close proximity and generally there is no apprehension of separation from each other. Again their love is not self-less. It thrives on giving and receiving and both are expected to respond to each other; otherwise the flame of love would vanish and become a thing of the past. It is founded upon mutual trust and consideration of equality. Husband and wife should respect each other as equal partners. But in the love of the other type, the heart is always burning with a desire to meet the lover. Soul's love for God is not on equal basis. Even as God's beloved, the soul loves Him as His servant. But God is so pleased by the love of the soul, that He forgets His greatness and allows the soul to enjoy His love as if it (Soul) were His master. In the Divine love of the beloved type, both the soul and God are unconscious of their status. The soul enjoys God's love and God enjoys soul's love, as lovers, and not as a servant and master. There is mutual attraction. In the beloved type of love, the soul has to pass through fiery ordeal, before its love is reciprocated by God.

We shall illustrate, the Beloved type of love, otherwise known as the Gopi-love in Vaisnavism. It is described in the 10th Skandha of the Bhagawata in chapters (26 to 31) dealing with Krishna's Dance with the Gopis. The description in question is the symbolical representation of God's sport of Dance with the souls, in union with Him. Krishna is supreme as Brahman or Atman in the Upanishads, as also Truth, Beauty and Love. Also He is Being, Consciousness and Bliss. He is omnipresent, omniscient and omnipotent—and also the creator of the world and the controller of all the cosmic activities. The Gopis are the most highly advanced devotional souls, who though born as human beings, not only aspire for the love of God, but live only for that love. Although they were living in the world, in the midst of worldly relatives—husbands, children, parents etc., they were not attached to them. They were in the world and yet did not belong to the world. Neither worldly happiness, nor heavenly happiness, nor attainment of supernatural powers, nor liberation, detracted their mind from love for God in which they found their happiness. Though married to others, they believed that God alone could claim their heart. Krishna's Dance with the Gopis is only the representation of the aspiration of the divine souls for the enjoyment of God's love and points the way to other souls for God-realisation. The word 'Krishna' etymologically is derived from the root 'Krish' which means 'to draw'. God's love is to be enjoyed by those on whom God's grace descends. The Gopis are God's most endeared souls. In order to make them participate in His Bliss and Love, God draws the souls unto Him, on the bank of the river Yamuna by playing upon his flute. The river Yamuna typifies constant stream of love for God. The flute symbolises the knowledge of God. The Gopis hearing the melodious music of Krishna's flute were overwhelmed with joy, and immediately left their houses, husbands, children, and parents and ran to the place where Krishna was playing upon his flute. No consideration of social and ethical loves prevented them from meeting Krishna. Those who were prevented from going, stayed at home and mentally remembered Krishna and breathed their last. Krishna pointedly said that intercourse with the paramour is strictly forbidden in the scriptures. The Gopis declared that they have not come with the intention supposed by him (Krishna). They said, "We have renounced the world and all its pleasures and have snapped off even the family ties. We are in the midst of the world but our heart and soul are with you. You are our master, nay our Love. We live in the world only for your love. The holy books teach us that the best love is love for God. Believing in the holy books we offer our love to you. How can love, offered to God be a sin? You are wrong in giving us advice to direct our love for God to our worldly relations. You are the master of our souls; the self of all selves. As souls, we belong to you being your parts representing your consciousness. We are yours.

"We have no interest in worldly happiness. Our happiness is centered in enjoying your love alone. You are always in our thoughts. Since long we have been separated from you, and suffered its pangs. We have been waiting to meet you. That time has now come, since, you yourself have called us to this place. It does not behave you to frustrate our hope. Our hearts are captivated by you and we have abandoned our homes and our relations only for your love and not for sexual pleasure. We know that the love for God is Divine and transcendental. Ours is not the love of flesh. It is the love of the spirit for the Divinity. Our souls belong to you. You are the Lord of our souls. We have come to you to present our souls to you, so that you may receive them and bless them, once more to live with you inseparately participating in the bliss of Love with you.

We are not creatures—of flesh and blood, but pure spirit—your own 'consciousness' separated from you by your will. We have cut off all the worldly connections, so that souls may get the bliss of the Divine. We beseech you most humbly to accept our love and not to dishearten us. If you reject our love, it will be death for us." On hearing their words, Lord Krishna was moved with compassion. He accepted their love smilingly and granted them the joy of sporting with Him. Overwhelmed by the joy, they, assembling round Him in a group, enjoyed His love, by singing, embracing and dancing with Him.

In their excessive joy, they become proud and thought themselves superior to other women on earth. With a view to curbing their pride, Lord Krishna immediately disappeared on the very spot. Not seeing Him, the Gopis felt agonised and began quest for Him in the wood, putting questions to the trees about Krishna's whereabouts, but not receiving any reply, discontinued search and identifying themselves with Krishna, began to imitate His sports in Vraja—some Gopis acting the part of Krishna and others of the Gopis. But this imitation-way failed; so they resumed their search again; which helped them to discover the foot-prints of Krishna with one of the Gopis.

Following the footsteps they saw one Gopi (Radha) alone, who was abandoned for her pride. They went to the bank of the Yamuna and began to chant Krishna's praises. "Have mercy on us. Do not forsake us. We are your humble servants. We repent for our folly. We forgot ourselves and became proud. Oh, Dearest, forgive us and reveal Yourself to us. Your lovely face has captivated our souls. The beauty of your eyes has smitten our heart. Life without you is intolerable to us.

People know you as the son of Yashoda but we know that you are God and have come for the protection of the world. It is, therefore, your duty to protect us by revealng Yourself to us. Be pleased, to show us Your charming lotus-like face. Look at us, with a gentle smile and speak words full of love and sweetness."

This love of the Gopis is Divine. Krishna's love for the Gopis is also Divine, because it is God's love for the Gopis—who are His loving devotees. Neither the Gopis, nor Krishna, desired indulgence in sexual pleasures. It is just to give delight of love to His devotees that He designs to sport with them and reciprocate their love. Otherwise as God, He Himself being free from any desire would not condescend to accept their love. He himself is personification of Perfect Love, and so he can have no sexual desire with others. To make the soul participate in bliss, God descends to the plane of the Divine souls and gives His love to them on their footing of equality, which remains perfect, unaffected and undiminished.

The Divine Love is like fire, which by its touch removes the dirt of a base metal, put into it, softens and purifies it. The temporal love is similarly converted into purest crystalline transcendental love if it is directed to God. Just as parched rice lose their power of fertility, so, what is called sex-love is transmuted into divine love, if directed to God. If this love of the Gopis, were profane, Uddhava, the greatest of the Yogis, would not have paid in most fervent terms, a tribute to the Gopis. He was sent with a message by Krishna from Mathura to console the Gopis during His absence from Gokula. Remembering Krishna's love, they used to pass their days and nights in grief. Uddhava conveyed the message of Krishna to them, "Oh, Gopis, I know what sorrow you must be feeling in my absence but you know why I have come to Mathura. Although I am here my heart is with you. There can be no separation between you and Me (God). I am enshrined in your heart. Do not think that I am away from you. Instead of passing your time in pangs of separation you should mentally think of Me and you will realise that I am with you." The Gopis listened to the message with rapt attention. At first they rejoiced that Krishna was remembering them; but they did not appreciate Krishna's advice of practising Yoga. Uddhava also insisted on it as a way to forget their sorrows. But they replied, "Oh, Uddhava, tell Krishna that we thank him for His remembrance; but it is cruel on His part to advise us to resort to Yoga and forget His love. We on our part, prefer the pangs of separation for Him to meditating on Him mentally. What joy can meditation give to us? We want to enjoy His love in His presence. Can meditation give us that enjoyment?

We take delight in the moon and not in its all pervading light. We have nothing to do with omnipresent God. We want to enjoy love in the company of our personal God, who is embodiment of love. The omnipotent God is no good for us. Krishna's graceful gait, merry laughter, playful glances, sweet words and beauty of His face have so much charmed us that we think of Him alone. It is not possible for us to forget His love. We will prefer death to forgetting His love."

With tearful eyes, they ended their speech and Uddhava's heart was deeply touched. He felt prostrate at their feet and said, Oh Gopis, today I have understood your love for Krishna. When your love is so deep and intense, it is wrong to advise you to have recourse to meditation for forgetting Him. The Yoga is not for the Divine souls like you. You are right in what you have said. Your love is true love, not lust. Such love is very rare. Even God Brahma cannot have that love. It is wonderful that simple women like you, can possess such deep and absolute love for God. Would that, I were born as one of the shrubs, creepers or herbs of Brindawana which come in contact with the dust of the feet of these highly blessed women who abandoned their relations for God. They live in fool's paradise who denounce their love as adultery." With these words he touched the dust of their feet and taking leave of them, returned to Mathura to acquaint Krishna with the love-lorn condition of the Gopis.

The other way of love by which God's love is experienced by the devotee is the Radha Type of love, known as sweet sentiment (Madhurya Bhava). The Radha-type love is termed as Swaminibhava by Vallabhacharya and that is considered higher than the

Gopi-love. In the Gopi-type love, the relation between God and the souls is that of the master and the servants. There is no equality. The souls do not forget that they are servants of God. That kind of love is obtained by self-surrender, dedication, sacrifice, and submission. The Swaminibhava is on a plane of equality between God and the soul. God forgets that He is the Lord, and accepts the love of the soul as His equal. No doubt Radha is also one of the Gopis; yet she holds equality with Krishna.

One writer writes, "when beings are perfected, they reach the plane of Krishna. The Gopis are such perfected beings. Radha is the chief of such perfected beings, from whom God never parts. If symbolically the Gopis represent the outer powers of love-form of God, to be expressed in physical actions of love, Radha is the inner experience. It is the Siddhashakti of Love-God, without which love can not be manifested in the outer forms. This is the highest type of Divine Love. Both the Gopi-type and the Radha-type love are Divine love. The difference between them is that of a degree. Any how, for God-realisation, all earthly loves must be transcended and one's love should be directed to God alone. The Radha-type love is not for all. Even Gopi-type love is difficult to be achieved. The Gopi-type is only an ideal for all kinds of souls irrespective of their sex, provided they seek God's love, renouncing world and attachments.

The love of the adulteress-type also falls under this head, though it is of the lowest kind. All these types are the varieties of Divine Love, but there are differences of the degree. In short the love of any kind, mentioned above if directed to God is known as the Divine Love. The poet Byron in one of his poems, speaks about the divine nature of love;

Yes, Love indeed is light from heaven,
A spark of that immortal fire;
With angels shared, by Allah given
To lift from earth our low desire;
Devotion wafts the mind above,
But heaven itself descends in love,
A feeling from the God-head caught,
To wean from self each sordid thought
A ray of Him, who formed the whole
A glory circling round the soul.

Byron's eulogy of love is in praise of temporal love. He knows nothing of the Divine Love, and, yet he pays such a fine tribute to the power of love. Vallabhacharya accepts only the Radha-type and the Gopi-type of love, the former for his own personal experience and the latter for the devotees. The parental-type of love is accepted for the Divine service of God as Bala-Krishna.

Shri Vallabhacharya always believed himself as the Swamini of Lord Krishna, and mentally experienced the Divine Love of the Radha-type. That love is described by Jayadeva in his Gita-Govinda and by Vitthalnathaji (son of Vallabhacharya) in his poetical work *Shringar-Rasa-Mandana*. It cannot be acquired unless a devotee is free from all the worldly ties and desires. Very few, especially those who are most favoured whom God loves as His equals are likely to reach the Radha-type of love by God's grace. The souls in the worldly state should endeavour to get the Gopi-type of love. In the first stage, the devotee is a seeker of God's love, while in the second stage, God is a seeker of the devotee's love. In short, the plane of the divine love is reached by the devotee by transcending all other loves such as self-love, family-love social love, nay, even the Universal love.

DIVINE LIFE

We now turn to the way indicated by him for living a Divine Life. The Divine life, is a kind of new birth of the soul. The soul will become godly and belong to Him. It was God's, before its birth, but as it forgot its relation to God, he got itself entangled into worldly life and so became a bound soul. Now realising the relation through knowledge and devotion, he changes his nature so that his love and attachment having been withdrawn from the worldly objects become greater progressively for God. It now considers this life as a temporary halting on its sojourn to its destination namely enjoyment of God's Bliss. Before a soul becomes fit for the divine life its nature must undergo transformation. It must be completely free from the sordid grossness of worldliness and turn to the divinity. In its new career, it must change its outlook of life. It must aspire for only God's love. This does not mean that it is not to have any other love such as love for wife, children or for mankind in general, but with all this love, the soul is to seek and attain God's love. For, if all is God and if God is love, love for all is included in the love of God. Love for humanity is also a representation of God's love and yet God's love transcends the love for humanity or the universal love. The devotee who is on the path of divine life loves all things, even of the world, as they are God's things and so in loving them, he has no attachment to them. It is self-less love for them—the love for God's sake. By this way his worldly love is transmuted into shining gold. The aspirant of divine life must possess all the qualities of a *Sthita Pragna* and also of a devotee mentioned in Chapters II and XII of the Bhagavad Geeta. The Bhagavad Gita treats these qualities in Chapter XVI under the title of the Divine Qualities. The qualities expected of the aspirant of Divine Life are fearlessness, absolute purity of heart, constant absorption of mind in meditation for God—realisation, charity, self-control, sacrifice, study of the scriptures, straight-forwardness, non-violence, truth, absnece of anger, renunciation, peace, absence of back-biting, compassion to creatures, freedom from grief, softness, sense of shame, sublimity, forbearance, fortitude, purity and absence of malice and pride. The Gita also mentions the vices namely—hypocrisy, arrogance, pride, anger, harshness and ignorance. Unless they are first eschewed, the divine qualities cannot be attained. They are like seeds in the field. The thistles etc. should be removed from the soil of the field and it must be well tilled if good crop is expected, before these are sown. So, according to the Gita for the development of devotion the vices must be first rooted out .The character building is a pre-requisite for a religious life. A religious man's life must be morally good. It is a qualification for entering the divine life. The way to divine life is indicated by Vallabhacharya in his "Sixteen Works". In each one of these works, he lays emphasis on a particular aspect of the Divine Life.

The plan outlined by him is indicative of the evolutionary process leading finally to the goal of God-realisation. Since the devotee's goal is God-Realisation, he is indifferent to Righteousness (Dharma), material wealth (Artha), worldly happiness (Kama) and liberation (Moksha). But it is not easy to reach this goal without the knowledge of the nature of God and the soul's relation to Him. By knowledge he will know that God's love is to be sought from Personal God who is Love, and that the soul as a part of God should seek Him by devotion. He should now take the path of devotion for translating what he knew into action, through service of

God. The service of God is a practical way but before the devotee betakes to it, he has to take a vow of consecration before God's image that, hence forth, he would regard all his possessions and relations to be God's and not his and would not use them for his personal good. He should attribute all happenings in life to the Will of God. As God is his care-taker and protector, he should not entertain any anxieties. He should also know that his soul is the Pushti soul, and not worldly or spiritual soul. As such, he seeks God's love, which is higher than a spiritual love. It is incumbent on him to renounce worldly life and seek God's Bliss by love. In course of its development, this love passes through three phases —(1) attraction to the Divinity (Sneha) (2) attachment to the Divinity (Asakti) and (3) finally a condition of suffering intense agonies of separation from God (Vyasana). In this last stage God is moved to come down to the soul and to reveal Himself to it and shower His blessings on it and enjoys its love. This is known as Nirodha of the soul. Shri Arvinda describes the love experience of the soul with the Divinity in the following words:—

"Its relations of love and delight will be the play of the Divine ecstasy, for God is love and delight and what with us would be denial of love and delight, will be the holding back of joy in the still sea of bliss, so that certain forms of Divine Union and enjoyment may be brought in front in an ecstasy of swelling of waves of the bliss. So also all its becomings will be formation of the Divine being, in response to these activities. At the same time this oneness will not preclude relation of the divine soul with God. With its supreme self, founded on the joy of difference, separating itself from unity to enjoy that unity. Otherwise it will not annul the possibility of any of those exquisite forms of God-enjoyment which are the highest rapture of the God—a God-lover in his clasp of the Divine." (The Life Divine)

Arvind's way for reaching this goal of the divine life is through integral Yoga in which action, knowledge and devotion are assimilated into one homogeneous element. According to Vallabhacharya, there is no such integration or co-ordination but predominance of only love and again it is not God in the form of God-Sat-Chit-Ananda (Being consciousness-Bliss) but as Krishna, personification of Love and Bliss. Vallabhacharya's devotion points to this goal of the Divine Life.

For daily experience of God, a mode of Divine Service has been introduced by Vallabhacharya so that the devotee will have thought of God ever in his mind. The body and the senses are trained for God's service, but the real love-experience by which God reveals Himself to the devotee is through the mental service (Manasi Seva).

It is pure and free from the grossness and sordidness of worldliness.

It is supra-cosmic and supra-sensuous and basks in the sunshine of God's glory. It is not realisable by any amount of knowledge or religious disciplines except by God's grace. The soul that has achieved the Divine Love, does not care for anything except God's love. Hariraiji indicates three steps in the development of the Divine Love. It is rooted in the devotion by which the devotee, in the preliminary stage, tries to know the nature or form of the Divinity which is 'Ananda' (Bliss). He then focuses his mind on that form, and by contemplation, comes to love Him. Then the mind reflects upon God's Lilas mentioned in the Bhagvata. By this, his mind is completely detached from the world and is attached to Him. Now he feels acute pangs of his separation from God. His days pass in longing for meeting God. This is a very trying and critical stage of mental distress and restlessness. It is a state of Sarvatmabhava in which the devotee feels, by the intensity of his love, the presence of God, not in the outer world; but also in all the parts of his body, his senses and his mind. His soul sees God in all the objects. He opens his eyes, and feels the presence of God before him. He hears some voice and feels the rapture of having heard God's voice. Every movement around him reminds him of God's approach to him. This is how the idea of the divine soul is understood by Vallabhacharya. When it reaches culmination, God of His own accord, reveals Himself before Him and accepts him as His own. The Divine Love thus, restores the soul to God from which it is never separated.

Chapter IX

AESTHETICISM

Shri Vallabhacharya has not thought of the concept of Beauty as the important element of aesthetics separately and formulated any theory about it, because he was more of a religious teacher-cum-mystic than a mere philosopher. He has evolved some principles of philosophy, based on the Upanishads, only as countenancing his religious convictions in the attainment of God. If philosophy does not point to the way to God, it is not worth its salt. Knowing that the aim of life, being God-realisation, he has evaluated every means and science in relation to God. According to the Upanishadas God or Brahman is the Highest Reality. He is Truth-Consciousness and joy. The true aspect of God, known as 'being' is manifested in the world, the knowledge aspect known as 'consciousness' is manifested in the souls. The joy aspect is unmanifested in the world of the souls. God is transcendental .The joy-form of God is designated as Rasa or Love. We may call it Beauty also. So God in His joy or love-form is Beauty. Some identify God with Truth (Satyam) but it is inadequate representation of God. He is Beauty also and that is the highest conception of God. God's Beauty, though not visible to human beings is reflected in the external appearance and features of all the subjects and objects.

To realise God, it is essential that one must perceive beauty which is hidden under the guise of the external appearance and love it. He should love beauty in every form believing that it is God's beauty. By loving Beauty, one loves God and realises Him. The man who abhors beauty is away from the path of God-realisation. But this love for beauty is not for beauty's sake or for any other purpose, but only for God's sake. In loving a beautiful object, he should know that he is loving God. Vallabhacharya does not separate it from love. Beauty and love are to be thought as synonyms. There is no line of demarcation dividing their realms. Where there is beauty there is love and vice versa. God is Love, and Love is beauty.

Beauty either in the subject or in the object is not its own; but from God, who is perfect Beauty. Just as in the objective world, it is revealed in diverse forms—natural or man-made, it is also revealed in God's subjective creation. The Upanishada declaress that God evolves out of Him the various objects with forms, as well as the word. The former is termed as *Rupa Srishti* of God and the latter the *Nama Srishti.* The Beauty of Nama Srishti is revealed through words with their powers of denotation. God's beauty is revealed in the prose forms such as a story, a novel, an essay, a drama and in poetry such as lyrics, songs, odes, episodes; even in all musical notes and in their figures, qualities and sentiments. A song has no beauty of its own but if it appeals to any one who listens to it, it is God's beauty, which comes out from the song and touches the heart of the listeners, in whom also there lies dormant beauty of God. If beauty were not dormant in the listener's heart, the song, howsoever excellent, would not attract the attention of the listener, so in the relation of the subject-object, ultimately, it is the beauty of God, neither of the subject nor of the object.

The Greek Philosopher, Plato regards Absolute Beauty as real and abstract. The Beauty in the objective world, is only a copy of the Absolute Beauty—an eternal idea. The Beauty of a picture is only a copy of the absolute beauty and not real. He believes that there is an organised realm of ideas each of which enjoys immutability and eternity. This organised realm is real in the sense that they are independent entities not depending upon our mind, either finite or infinite. According to him, the absolute beauty is independent of any kind. It cannot be grasped by mind or senses. Hence the objective beauty is not real. This view is erroneous. In the first place he conceives of eternal ideas existing independently without subsistence in any ultimate substance, secondly because, he thinks that the objective beauty is only a copy and it is not real like the original. But he forgets the fact that the copies are as real as the original; because the copy is nothing but the reproduction of the original. The original is one, but it may be reproduced in many copies. The copy neither adds nor substracts from the original. We may say that the objective beauty is not all the beauty of God, but we are not justified in holding that the partial beauty is unreal. There is no difference between God's beauty and the objective beauty.

Aristotle thought of Beauty in an analytical method. He did not agree with Plato's view. He thought of it consisting of the universal elements—order, symmetry and definitioness. He says that a certain magintude is desirable in beauty. An animal may either be too small or too large to be beautiful, when it cannot be surveyed as a whole. Berkely was an idealist. He would not recognise physical beauty. It is all mental, but he would stretch his argument further and assume that, ultimately every idea exists in his argument, beauty ultimately would exist in God. Kant recognises only moral beauty and would make it transcendental. Spinoza perceives Beauty in all the things.

Vallabhacharya would accept this partially. According to him, the beauty is transcendental though immanent in all the objects. Kant judges beauty from certain criteria which are expressed in the statement—"That is beautiful which pleases us by quality and quantity disinterestedly," but he lays down certain conditions. God's beauty is revealed without any human considerations. It depends upon the will of God. Lord Shaftesbury perceives beauty as physical, spiritual and divine. He is right in holding the Divine beauty as ultimate beauty.

Some think 'Unity' of the constituents of a beautiful object, as a determining principle of beauty, but if it is applied to the outer beauty, then the principle is defective, as it represents only one side of truth.

Croce was one of the greatest lovers of Beauty. In his work 'Aesthetics' (1902) he makes certain statements about beauty, which are worth noting. He says that beauty is the mental formation of an image (or a series of images) that catches the essence of the thing perceived. Again he observes that the beauty belongs, rather to the inward image than to the outward form in which it is perceived. According to him, the beauty of a thing is its essence and it is experienced by the inward image, which is nothing but intuition. He denies that beauty can be perceived by the senses or intellect. But what is this intellect? Is it not a kind of knowledge? The beauty of a thing cannot be revealed by intention, but by love for the thing. A thing in itself may be deformed, and yet it appears as beautiful to those who love it. If one has no love for the thing presented to him, however beautiful it may be in the eyes of others, it will fail to impress him. To one who is deaf or indifferent to music, even the sweetest song of a master of music will fail in charming him. So the beauty of anything will be revealed to those who love the thing. Otherwise, they will be indifferent to it, or condemn it. So the essential thing required for the revelation of the beauty in a thing is the love on the part of the subject. He is right in asserting that beauty is an essence of the things. We would rather modify it and say that it is the essence of ulitmate beauty i.e. God, because all individual things are the existence of God. They originate from God, hence their beauty also originates from God. This beauty is to be perceived and enjoyed by those who have love for God.

Vallabhacharya's attitude is not that of an utilitarian, an idealist or of a rationalist thinker. It is not for self-enjoyment, gratification of senses or for profiteering. He does not hold the theories —(1) Beauty for Beauty's sake (2) Beauty for virtue's sake or (3) Beauty for pleasure's sake, but he would hold the theory of Beauty for God's sake. One who loves God and His beauty as revealed in the objective world in any form is moved only by love for God. He thinks the whole world as beautiful, and whenever he beholds it, his heart is so enraptured that one cannot but give vent to his feeling of exhilaration which is expressed in eulogistic words. How beautiful is God's world! I must love it, because it reveals God's beauty, and I must reach God's beauty through this. He sees flowers and exclaims, "How much my God will be delighted if I present them to the image of God!" If he happens to see a beautiful design on a piece of cloth, he will not use it for himself, but will offer it to God. The beauty is not for self gratification, but for pleasing God. If there is a motive of the utility behind the concept of beauty, it is the utility of a higher kind, as it is to be utilised in God's service only. Thus the idea of utility, even if it is there, is highly sublimated. There is no consideration either of the good of the individual or of the society but that of service of God. His view is, that every kind of beauty must impress upon its lover to love God and serve Him. To him Poetry, Art, Music, Sculpture, etc. which are the media for the expression of beauty are valued only for their being used in the service of God. Vallabhacharya's ideal of beauty is Lord Krishna who is Love and Joy personified. He loves beauty, because he loves God. God, as beautiful, has been, manifested everywhere externally and internally in all beings. God's beauty is revealed in all objects, men, animals, birds etc., as well as in natural and even in physical objects made by men for their use. All these forms of beauty ultimately are derived from the eternal beauty of God. A man loves a natural object, a sunset cloud, a rippling river, a landscape, a tree or a flower, because in them is revealed the beauty of God. These things have no beauty of their own. Even nature has no beauty of its own but that only, which is derived from God. In loving nature, we love not nature but God. We say that Wordsworth and Shelley were great lovers of nature but we should say that they were in one sense lovers of the beauty of God. A picture or a fine piece of carpet, seems beautiful to us. The beauty does not belong to the object nor to the artist who made it, but it is the beauty derived from God. The artist in fashioning a beautiful thing is guided internally by the ideal of beauty which simply copies the greatest ideal of beauty i.e. God.

There are two schools of thought among the aestheticians, one believing that the beauty is subjective, the other that it is the objective. According to the first school, when one loves or is attracted towards a particular object, say, a lovely flower, a sunlit cloud, a landscape on the bank of a river, a picture of some scene of nature or music or acting, it is the beauty of an object, either in its form or quality, that is the cause of attraction. The beauty of an object appeals to every body and captivates the heart of its beholder i.e. the subject. In the opinion of the other school, the object may be destitute of beauty, and yet, the subject will derive joy from it. To a Negro his child though ugly is always an object of love. This means that beauty is subjective and not objective. If beauty is objective, how is it that the same person who once enjoys listening to a musical composition or a particular picture feels disgust for it at another time? The reason is that it is not objective. It depends upon the mood of the subject. A man with a sound mind will enjoy the object better than the sick man. An object may be very beautiful but unless the subject possesses imagination to behold it, it will not attract the subject. So beauty is in the imagination of a subject. On this question, the comments of Emerson are worthy of note. He says, 'Things are pretty, graceful, rich, handsome but until they reach the imagination, they are not beautiful. It is not in the form but in the mind. Emerson, in these words, holds the view that beauty is subjective.

To Vallabhacharya, Beauty is unanalysable. It is to be appreciated as a whole and not to cut it into bits by water-tight divisions of subjective and objective beauty; because the source of all beauty is God. It is God, who by His will has manifested in the two forms of the subject and the object. The souls which represent His consciousness are subjects and the world which represents with its multiform is the object. His 'being' aspect is the object. The subjects are enjoyers of beauty and the objects are objects of enjoyment—enjoyable. This world is created by God for His Divine sport and enjoyment. For that purpose He has revealed His beauty in diverse forms in the objects and in the (souls) subjects. The subject and object differences are imaginary, not real. They are forms of God, manifested by God for His own enjoyment. He has diffused this beauty in the subjects and the objects. In the subject it is in his mind and in the object in its form as well as quality. God is the enjoyer and is also the enjoyable. Both the subject and the object have beauty which is not theirs but God's.

To experience and enjoy the Divine Beauty, Vallabhacharya has suggested the mode of Divine Service or Seva. It is so called because it is entirely rendered to God through his image. It differs from other kinds of services such as social, though all other forms of service are comprised within it. To enjoy the Divine Beauty means to express love for God and participate in his Bliss, which is the goal of a God-seeker, in this life. The image of God represents God, and is conceived as God in His aspect of Beauty. So the service is made joyful and beautiful with all the necessary beautiful paraphernelia in the forms of music, painting, decorations etc. with beautiful atmosphere. The image of God during daily service, as well as during festive occasions, is dressed in the most beautiful garments, decked with the beautiful ornaments and jewellery, served with the best of food and adorned beautifully with garlands of the choicest flowers. Music and painting are also employed in the service of God. Music consists of all the different types of songs, such as cards, bullebies etc. with a variety of tunes relating to the Lilas of Krishna as a child and a boy. The place where the image is kept is surrounded by the best pictures depicting God's Lilas in Gokula and Brindavana and beautiful scenes of natural objects.

The mode of Divine service is most adequate for it; for, it engages the body, the senses, the mind and the soul of the devotee in contemplation and all are absorbed in the enjoyment of the God's Beauty.

Keats says, 'A thing of beauty is a joy for ever;' but Vallabhacharya would amend it, 'A thing of beauty is a joy for ever because it is God's beauty'. Perceived as an isolated thing of beauty, it may give joy which is only temporary; but when it is viewed as an object revealing God's beauty it becomes a joy for ever. As beauty of the thing only, it gives physical, but when conceived as a thing revealing God's beauty in it, it acquires the character of Divine beauty. Keats who felt so highly the joy of beauty, was ignorant of the joy of Divine Beauty.

Vallabhacharya had no glamour for abstract Beauty. He loved every kind of beauty in reference to God. He considered all the beautiful objects in the world as expressive of God's Beauty. To him, God was not beauty but the beautiful and he loved God's beauty in His personl form. He loved and paid obessiance to Krishna, who was his God-Perfect Love and Beauty.

God's beauty is indescribable but can be described concretly in His personal form. In one song called '*Madhura Ashtaka*' he describes the beauty of Krishna's limbs, fluite, cows, food, songs, dances, gait, clothes and ornaments. All these are sweet because Krishna is Himself the Lord of Sweetness. In the song, he does not describe God Krishna, as the creator of the universe or the Lord of 'All', but as the Lord of sweetness and says that as Krishna is the Lord of Sweetness or sweetness incarnate, everything associated with Him is sweet. The only word by which God's beauty can be praised by a devotee is 'Sweet'. In another poem addressed to the river 'Yamuna', he beholds in her and extols its beauty as a beloved of God, fourth in rank. It is symbolical of supreme love of God. It is a river, but it is described as a Deity. Yamuna is possessed of so much beauty that even the God of love will be more glorious by her. She is compared with a lady, having her waist encircled by a girdle in the form of the bank, and surrounded by maids in the form of the birds, parrots, peacocks, swans etc. The sands on the banks resemble the bracelets of pearls on the hand like waves. Vallabhacharya further says that by drinking its waters, man's all sins are removed, his body becomes divine and his nature is changed so that he will acquire fitness for God's love.

Such tribute to the beauty of a river is unique in the literature of the world. From this, we understand the kind of beauty, he loved. It is that which united a man with God and make him feel love for God. Such a beauty is not met with in the world in human spheres or in objects associated with human beings. The aim of the beauty of the earthly objects, without reference to God, is to produce a temporary pleasure of the senses. It has nothing holy in it. The beauty in reference to God is on the contrary, holy, chaste and restrained, and capable of yielding supreme bliss in the form of the enjoyment of God's love.

Poetry, Art and Music are valued by Vallabhacharya as means of God-realisation. They are the gifts of God and must be offered to Him for His adoration. The poet is to adore God, by his poetical compositions, the painter by his pictures and the musician by his songs. These gifts are not given to them for the satisfaction of their sense-feeling which is nothing but making a misuse of it. The beautiful objects must be loved not because they are conducive to pleasure but because they are the media of communion with God. A devotee is not averse to beauty but he enjoys it, believing that every form of beauty is God's creation and reflects His own beauty in a limited measure. The poets, the artists and the musicians are also devotees, if their poetry, art and music are devoted to the beauty of God.

The Gita-Govinda by Jayadeo and the songs by Suradasa are the best poems because they aim at depicting the beauty of God Krishna in one way or another. They resorted to the singing of God's beauty in verse as a Nirodha (discipline of concentration of mind on God). The ideal of God as the Beautiful is favourite with the Devotional School, especially the Vaishnavite School in India. This ideal is received by that school from the Bhagavata, which describes the (*lilas*) sports of God Krishna. The word Krishna used for God is not only for any historical personage or a Human being, but for the Vedantic concept of Brahman standing for the ultimate principle also. The God of Bhagavata is not only the creator, sustainer and the destroyer of the world, nor as Akshara —impersonal and immovable, omni-present and omniscient— having 'Being and Consciousness' as His aspects, but supreme bliss—Ananda or Love. No doubt truth and knowledge also constitute God, but God is something more than these. He is besides Truth and knowledge—Love or Joy—which is expressed in the beautiful objects. The author of the Bhagavata describes Krishna's beauty in the Xth book which is full of exquisite descriptions of the Brindavana, the land of Krishna's boyhood, the river Yamuna, its trees and flowers, the cows, the cow-boys and the sports and dances which Krishna enjoyed with them. The author's aim is not to describe them for their beauty only but because his heart becomes rupturous at the thought that these were associated with Krishna—the Beautiful God. Every part of that land and every object He touched or came in contact with, was under the magnetic influence of Krishna's beauty. With Krishna in Brindavana life was full of charm and love; but when Krishna left it, it was dull and devoid of beauty. According to the author of the Bhagavata, the presence of Krishna invests the atmosphere of Gokula and Brindavana with beauty. The scene of Krishna's playing upon a flute is the finest description in the Bhagavata. It is entitled as 'Venu Gita' (The Music of the Flute.).

Krishna is symbolical Love form of God. Vallabhacharya explains by saying that Krishna is to be understood as God, who is Love; and the Brindavana, the heart of the devotee, the flute, the knowledge of God as Love and the pea-cock, flowers and garland etc. worn by Him are suggestive of the kinds of beauty. If the devotee's heart is laden with love and simplicity, he will realise God in his heart. To experience God's love, the heart must be pure and beautiful by non-attachment to the world. The aim of beauty is to feel God's love or realise God. We are endowed with senses, only for the enjoyment of God's love, for, that is the supreme end of life.

Art, Music, Poetry, scuplture etc. serve as media for the expression of beauty, but they must be valued only for God's sake, for the delight of God. Otherwise they have no place in the divine life. The purpose of art is to make one's life spiritual and religious for love of God.

According to Shri Arvinda, Art is discovery and revelation of Beauty, but it should reveal the beauty of the soul as well the beauty of the Divinity. Art should help an aspirant of the Divine life in to assist him in reaching the Highest. This is and must be a part, both of our aesthetic and our spiritual endeavour.

Again Shri Arvinda says, 'Beauty is not the same as delight, but like love, it is an expression—a form of—Ananda, created by Ananda and composed of Ananda. Vallabhacharya also takes the same view. He identifies it with 'Rasa'. It is a means by which a devotee can see God, the Beloved, every where. To a lover of Divine beauty, everything appears beautiful. Every where he sees God's beauty and fills him with delight, whether it is poetry, music, art, a dance or any scene of nature, he focuses his mind on God's Beauty, which not only moves his heart with love, but overfloods it with it.

Some thinkers who have reflected on the value of beauty in life, discriminate it from truth and goodness. But Vallabhacharya does not make distinctions between Beauty, Truth and Goodness. According to him, all these three co-exist together or truth and goodness co-operate and get frised in such a way in Beauty that they are not separately recognised. They are inherent in beauty, as its integral parts. There can be no beauty without the elements of truth and goodness. What is true must be beautiful. What is good, must be beautiful. Truth and goodness are the aspects of God's form of Beauty. All kinds of Beauty—physical, psychical or spiritual are the representations of supreme or Divine Beauty—Beauty of God. The claim for appreciation of beauty in the life of a devotee is supported on the ground of its being the beauty of God which is instrumental in the enjoyment of Delight in God-realisation.

According to Vallabhacharya, Truth, Goodness and Beauty are the different aspects in which supreme Reality reveals itself. It is not, however, that they exist separately from each other. It is goodness when goodness is pre-dominant, and it is Beauty when beauty is predominant, each obscuring the other two aspects. However, as existing in God, they are inseparable. It is not perfect Truth of God, if it is not good and beautiful. It is not perfect goodness of God without Truth and Beauty in it, and it is not perfect beauty of God, if devoid of truth and goodness. These three are inherent in God. They are media of experiencing God.

Every activity of a man has a certain value. There are different kinds of values, such as physical value of health, economic value of material prosperity, psychical value, including intellectual value of Truth, Ethical value of Goodness and Aesthetic value of beauty. As stated above, Vallabhacharya, does not make distinction of relative and absolute values, because in his views, God is not only the absolute value, but also he is the centre, conservation and consummation of all the values. Dr. Bhattacharya explains this point in his 'The Principle of Philosophy' p. 399, while examining the view of Prof. Hoffding, in these words "According to Hoffding, values are maintained in God....We agree with Hoffding in so far as he makes God the home of values, for values in their absolute sense can exist only in God, who is the supreme value." Dr. Bhattacharya, however differs from Hoffding in holding that the values though conserved in God are not static, they are progressive. So God is not only the conserving value but also the consummating value. Vallabhacharya would say the same thing. In his philosophy, Truth, Goodness and Beauty are absolute realities or real aspects of God, without possibility of mutual reduction or subordination. Since the ultimate goal of life, according to Vallabhacharya, is the attainment of God's Bliss or delight, all our sciences and pursuits must lead to that and should be directed to God for the enjoyment of Delight. The purpose of beauty is also the enjoyment of God's Delight. It is not delight of temporary character arising from Nature and Art. It is not selfish. A man who enjoys delight becomes conscious of God's presence every where. When he beholds natural beauty and feels delighted, it is because he feels the presence of God in it. The man who thus feels delight through beauty perceives God's beauty everywhere. He discovers no opposites. They shade off and merge into one another, evil into good, death into life, darkness into light, and the finite into Infinite. He will not hesitate from taking and smelling a rose because of its thorns. To him, even thorns, like its shape, colour and smell are the constituents of the beauty in the rose, which is representative of God who is Ananda or Delight. Vallabhacharya has no sympathy with those who escape God by fleeing from the world. He would ask all aspirants of the divine life to stay in the world and enjoy the delight of God in all pursuits. The Ananda (Delight) quality of God is everywhere. One can have it even from sorrows, pains, affronts, difficulties and tears. In short to seek God, be God-centred and enjoy the Delight of God in all that you do.

To sum up, the characteristics of beauty, according to Vallabhacharya, are as given below:

(1) We must love Beauty for the sake of God and not for our sense-gratification.

(2) God is the Highest Beauty It is the home of all values. It is a conserving as well as consumating value.

(3) A thing of beauty is a joy for ever. Its loveliness ever increases.

(4) Truth, Goodness and Beauty are the aspects of God and they exist in God, inseparably.

(5) The end of beauty is the revelation of God's Delight.

(6) A lover of true beauty puts high premium on character. If it is true beauty, it will make virtues shine and vices blush.

(7) The joy of beauty is, though individualistic, yet, universal and also transcendental, because it is the joy of the beauty of God.

(8) Beauty has its worth only if beautiful objects are used in God's service.

According to Vallabhacharya beauty is religious and is a means of enjoying the Ananda of God, who is described in the Upanishad as such. This is the end of his Aestheticism. All Arts, Music etc. poetry, dance have their worth only if they are employed in God's service and it is from this point of view that he has recognised their importance in his service—way of God-realisation as accessories for the revelation of God's delight, through beauty of God as explained in Chapter VI.

Shri Manilal C. Parekh, who has written an excellent work on the Life and Teachings of Vallabhacharya, alluding to this subject, writes as under:

"The aim of the faith of Vallabha is to worship God in His Ananda Form, which is His Highest and Truest Form. This form is moreover full of beauty and God is spoken of Beauty or is the fount of Beauty. Accordingly the worship is made as joyful and beautiful as it is possible to do. Most of the arts are pressed into the service of the Divine worship with the sole purpose of giving delight to God. We see here Aesthetics in some of its highest forms dedicated to the service of God and being sanctified in its turn by such use."

Some contend that the aesthetic pleasure is confined to the two senses of the eye and the ear. But Vallabhacharya says that it is to be felt by all the senses because there is beauty in all the objects of the colour, sound, smell, taste and touch and wherever there is beauty, there is pleasure or delight. Vallabha has three gradations of beauty (1) Physical to be appreciated by senses (2) Psychical, to be appreciated by the mind and (3) the Divine, which is experienced by the soul, when it is in tune with or in communion with God. The Bhagavata says, God is the fruit not of the eyes only, but of all the senses. All desires of the soul are satisfied when God is delighted by the soul's love. It is then that the soul experiences the true kind of delight. In this state of delight, the senses have no function, even the mind becomes passive; only the soul sees God before Him and enjoys His beauty and Love.

CHAPTER X

CONTRIBUTORS TO SHUDDHADVAITA PHILOSOPHY

The School of Suddhadvaita philosophy was originated by Vallabhacharya; but it was further strengthened, and perpetuated by his descendents, who made contribution to it by means of independent philosophical works as well as commentaries on Vallabhacharya's works. They are all in Sanskrit. We shall here indicate only a few important personalities among them; our concern here being only with the philosophical side.

Vitthaleshvara (1516 to 1586 A.D.):

He was the second son of Vallabhacharya. He was born at Charanata near Allahabad in 1516 A.D. It is said that his early education began under the guidance of Madhava Sarasvati. He studied all the scriptural works and the philosophical systems, but his mind was particularly impressed by the Bhagavata, which represented God as *Rasa* (Love) or Bliss. He had the benefit of studying the philosophical works of his father viz. *Tattva Dipa Nibandha*, *Sixteen Works*, *Subodhini*-commentary on the Bhagavat, *Anu-Bhashya*-commentary on the Brahma Sutra, which was incomplete. From these works his conviction in favour of the Suddhadvaita thought grew very strong. As a result of it, he became a staunch advocate of the Shuddhadvaita philosophy. He was only 15 years old, when his father left this world. Being equipped with profound erudition of philosophical nature, he, with a view to propagating the tenets of the Shuddhadvaita school, attended to the literary activities. He completed his father's "*Anu Bhashya*" commentary on the Brahma Sutras. He also wrote commentaries on the "sixteen works" and on some portion of the *Subodhini*, called '*Tippani*'. His original work, called '*Vidvan Mandana*' is highly appreciated by the oriental scholars as a unique work on the Shuddhadvaita. This work, as its title suggests, is really the ornament of the learned. It is conceived as a challenge to Shankara's Maya Vada–Theory of Illusion. It repudiates the arguments of Shankara's Mayavada as a logician, pointing out its fallacies and contradictions, wherein His refutation of Shamkara's Theories of Reflection and Super-imposition, and of the Nature of Brahman, though based upon Vallabhacharya's Tattva Dipa Nibandha, really reflects much credit on him, as a philosophical thinker. Shri M. T. Teliwala remarks that noble thoughts and powerful arguments are depicted in very graceful and flowing language and this charming treatise well deserves the name "Vidvan Mandana'—the ornament of the learned. He has also written treatise on the doctrine of Devotion as a means of God-realisation. viz. Bhakti Hansa (The Swan of Devotion). In the latter work, he proves from the texts of the scriptures, that devotion is not an effect from any cause. It is a spontaneous emotion for God, independent of any cause. It, owes its existence and growth to the grace of God. Though a means in the state of its development, it ceases to be a means later on. Besides being a philosopher and a Religions Teacher, he was a Poet and wrote many works on the *lilas* of God Krishna. He toured India several times to preach the message of Vallabhacharya's Shuddhadvaita and Pushti Marga. He attempted a commentary on the Gita. It was a scholarly attempt, but some how or other it ended where it began. However, his exposition of the Nyasadesha on the Gita (XVIII-65) is a masterly contribution. He introduced the mode of Divine Service as a means of experiencing love for God. He also gave due place to Art and Music in the performance of the Divine Service. He was highly popular. Even Emperor Akbar honoured him and granted him the noble title, 'Goswamy', which is hereditary to his descendents. He had among his followers not only Kings and wealthy persons, poets and artists but also persons of all classes, irrespective of their caste, creed or colour. His main teaching is "Love God without any selfish motive, only for enjoying God's love." He passed away in 1586 A.D.

Shri Gokulnathaji alias Vallabha (1552-1641 A.D.):

He was the fourth son of Sri Vithaleshaji. He was more a religious teacher than a philosopher. He lived during the reign of Emperor Jehangir. He popularised Vallabhacharya's teaching of the Pushti Marga especially through his discourses and talks in the Vrajabhasha. He wrote commentaries in Sanskrit on the 'Sixteen Works' of Vallabhacharya which amply enlightens the Shuddhadvaita philosophy. He was more inclined to the religious side of the Vallabha school then to its philosophical side. He emphasised that, knowledge was not much useful for God-realisation. Love for God alone was required for the devotee to realise God. He was, it is said, the first Acharya in the line of Vallabhacharya to use the vernacular medium for the religious discourses among his disciples. He is honoured as a protector of Pushtimarga, since he saved it from oblivion by the onslaughts of an ascetic named Chidrupa. His interpretation of Vallabhacharya's principles of devotion in some cases is original. In this respect he had at times gone beyond his grand father .It is said that he wrote in Sanskrit a masterly commentary named 'Lekha' on the Subodhini. His commentary explaining the significance of '*Gadya mantra*' in sanskrit is his most popular work among the Vaishnavas.

Shri Hariraiji (1591 to 1716 A.D.):

He was the great grandson of Vitthaleshaji. He revered Gokulnatha as his Guru. He was a poet-scholar. His work Brahmavada testifies his love for philosophy also. He wrote many works—small and big—in the form of eulogies to Krishna, commentaries on the 'Sixteen Works' of Vallabhacharya and on some verses of the Bhagavata (10th canto) relating to Krishna's *Lilas*. Like Gokulnathaji, he concentrated his mind on the *Prameya* (Grace) side of the Pushtimarga. According to him, the goal of a devotee is, firstly, suffering pangs of separation from God and enjoying God's love. He believed that the Pushti Marga was intended only for the elect souls and that these souls alone are eligible for God's grace. His most important work is 'Shiksha-Patra' written in verses and intended for the elucidiation of religious principles for the followers of Pushti-Marga. He has written some small works in Sanskrit in which he analyses and explains Vallabhacharya's concept of Supreme Reality of God's form as Love, Krishna as Supreme God, the way to experience love of God, the nature of Devotion, Dedication, liberation, etc. His writings contain the essence or gist of Vallabhacharya's teaching. He goes deep into the innermost meaning of Vallabhacharya's teaching and lays stress on that alone. The Vedic rituals have no place in his teaching. He lays much stress on God's mental service which he calls "*Mansi Seva*", by which the devotee should think in his mind on the *lilas* of Lord Krishna. To help a devotee in this discipline, he wrote a work called "*Sahasri Bhavana*." He emphasised that sterling character is principle criterion for a devotee. In one



Goswami Shri Vithaleshvara
See page 342



Goswami Shri Gokulnathji
See page 343


चित्रकार हीरालाल नवीहवेली
श्रीनाथद्वारा

Goswami Shri Hariraiji
See page 344



Goswami Shri Purushottamaji
See Page 345



Goswami Shri Yogi Gopeshvaraji
See page 346



Goswami Shri Giradharaji
See page 346

Goswami Shri Aniruddhacharya
See Page 347



Pandit Gattulalaji
See Page 348

of his works "*Kamakhya Dosha*"—Sin of Lust—he describes passion or lust as the greatest obstacle in the path of devotion. He warns his followers to be aware of hypocrites deeply engrossed in carnal or sensual—gratification under the garb of God's *lilas*. He describes their characteristic marks in a special work 'The marks of Hypocrites'. He lived for 125 years.

Purushottamaji (1668 to 1781 A.D.):

He was born in 1668 A.D. and was the seventh descendant of Vallabhacharya. He imbibed love of learning from his early childhood. He studied not only the works of the Vallabha school, but also made a comparative study of the works of all other Indian schools of philosophy. He was very faithful in interpreting the Shuddhadvaita or Brahmavada philosophy taught by Vallabhacharya. He wrote commentaries on the works of Vallabhacharya, such as the *Anu-Bhashya, The Tattva Dipa Nibandha, Patravalambana, The Purva Mimansa Bhasya* and also on some parts of Subodhini and "Sixteen Works". He has his commentary called *Suvarna Sutra* on the *Vidvan Mandan* of Vitthaleshji. It is highly praised by the scholars of the Shuddhadvaita Philosophy. He concentrated only on the Pramana side in the matter of the knowledge of *Brahman*. His independent works viz. *Prasthana Ratnakara, Srishti Bhedabheda-Prapancha*, Theory of Bhakti as a sentiment, *Atma Vada, Avatarvada*, and *Prahastavada*, are the most valuable contributions and are of permanent value to the Vallabha school. He wrote voluminously. It is said of him that during his travels he used to carry with him three cart-loads of books. It was he who for the first time introduced a comparative method of study in philosophical learning. In his commentaries, we do not only find references to the views of other philosophical schools, but also we read his criticisms of those schools. His independent views in favour of Vallabhacharya's Shuddhadvaita was the result of his study of the works of other schools from the experts. He was never dogmatic. His method of explaining his point of view, which was of course Vallabhacharya's, was logical. It is said that some works attributed to Pitambarji—his father—were written by him. He was unequalled in learning. He gave Shuddhadvaita Philossophy a permanent place in the History of the Indian Philosophy. He passed away in 1781 A.D.

Gopeshvaraji (1780-1830 A.D.):

He is known as Yogi Gopeshvara. As Purushottamaji had no son, Gopeshvara's father was adopted by him. He was fortunate to have an access to the manuscript collection made by Purushottamaji. His learning was prodigious. He carried, no doubt, Purushottamji's tradition of '*Pramana*'—further in his own way, however he compromised it with '*Prameya*' tradition of Gokulnathaji and Hariraiji. He was a master scholar of his time—not that he was conversant with all the *Shastras*, but studied them well.

He was honoured in the learned world, as (*Sarvagna*) 'knower of all' and as one 'who experienced or realised God in his heart'. Gopeshvara himself styles him by these epithets. His most monumental work is 'Rashmi' a commentary on the *Prakasha*' of Purushottamji on the Anu-Bhasya, a work nearly of 42266 verses. It is known as 'Rashmi' i.e. 'Rays' because like the Solar rays it throws light on the difficult part of the 'Prakasha'. It is his great merit that in elucidating a particular point, he finds support from the Upanishadas. But for the 'Rashmi' the Prakasha would have been difficult to understand. His work 'The Bhakti Martanda' shows what a great research scholar he was. He evaluaates the doctrine of Devotion under four separate heads-*Pramana, Prameya, Sadhana* and *Fala*. He has written a work called '*Navarthi on Taitireya Samhita*, which is not published as yet.

Girdharaji (1791-1840 A.D.) :

He was the tenth discendant of Vallabhacharya. He took the spiritual initiation (*Brahmasambandha*) from Dwarkanathaji. In about 1829 A.D. he constructed a grand temple at Benaras and started worship (Sewa) of Mukundraiji in that temple, where the worship continues even today. He was not only an ideal devotee but also a great Sanskrit Scholar. His contact with a profound Sanskrit scholar like Ramkrishna Bhatt helped him a great deal in attaining proficiency in several *Shastras*.

He also wrote works in Sanskrit. Some of the important works are (1) *Vivarana*—a commentary on the Anu Bhashya of Vallabhacharya (2) *Haritoshini*—a commentary on the Vidvanmandan of Vithaleshaji (3) *Balbodhini*—a lucid commentary on the Bhagavata (3) *Shruti Rahasya* (5) *Shuddhadvaita Martanda*—an excellent work on the Shuddhadvaita Vedanta. It has been commented upon by Pandit Ramkrishna Bhatt. Girdharji thus, enjoys a unique position. Unfortunately he passed away in 1840 A.D. at an early age of 49.

Aniruddhacharya (**1891-1939 A.D.**):

He was born at Bet Dwarka in 1891 A.D. and was the fourteenth descendant of Vallabhacharya. He was installed at temples (Havelis) at Nadiad and Jamnagar. He had ardent love for learning from his childhood and used to deliver lectures in Sanskrit at the age of 15. Later on he studied all the works of Shuddhadvaita School of philosophy and acquired mastery of the same. He had also made a comparative study of all the other Indian schools of philosophy. He was a great pioneer of the Sanskrit language and always admonished for its all round spread in right earnest. He honoured and helped the Pandits and the learned, and always welcomed them for religious discourse.

He also wrote works and commentaries in Sanskrit. Some of them are (1) Brahmamrita Bhashya on Gopal Purva Tapini Upanishad. (Published) (2) Vedanta Vidyalankara Bhashya on Narayana Upanishad (Published) and (3) Bhashya on Gopal Uttar Tapini Upanishad etc. (Unpublished).

He was the original founder of Pushti Margiya library, Nadiad.

In short he was a real Acharya with sterling character—the most fundamental requirement of the Bhakti Marga—besides a prominent scholar of an exhalted degree. He passed away in 1939 A. D.

The Poet-Emperor of Gujarat Shri Nahnalal D. Kavi, pays homage in the following words in his "Vaishnavi Shodash granth":— "In the history of the world, the contribution of the Vallabha dynesty continuing over a period of five hundred years is rare and unparalleled.

It will be a matter of great joy to learn if any other dynesty dating over five hundred years in Europe—in America—in Africa—nay on the surface of the earth, has contributed ,both qualitatively and quantitatively towards the philosophical literature, as has been done, by the Vallabha dynesty."

At present also many Goswami Maharajas equipped with comparative study of various schools of philosophy and religion are well-known for their profound tradition and mastery over oratorical powers in impressing upon the public with the teachings of the school.

Among the sons of the daughters of Goswamis, Lalu Bhatt, Jayagopala Bhatt, Bharata Martand Pandit Gattulalaji were great scholars and have contributed to philosophy as under:—

1. Lalu Bhatta (1632-1682 A.D.)
   His works are Nirnayarnava, Prameya-Ratnarnava and commentaries on Anu Bhashya, Subodhini and Nirodha Lakshan.
2. Jayagopal Bhatt's works are commentaries on Taiteriya Upanishad and Mandukya Upanishad.
3. Bharat Martanda Pandit Gattulalaji (1845 to 1898 A.D.) was born at Kotah (Rajasthan). His father's name was Ghanshyama Bhatt and mother's Lalubetiji. He lost his eyesight at the age of nine years on account of small-pox. He was, however, gifted with a very sharp memory which helped him a great deal in assimilating orally all the scriptures and Indian schools of philosophy and other works at the young age of 18 years. He had special mastery over the Shuddhadvaita school of philosophy and Pushtimarga. His memory developed to such an extent that he could compose verses and poems at the juncture and could reply to, there and there, a hundred of questions put to him in serial order without the least fault.

   He composed several works and commentaries. The published ones are (1) Vedanta Chintamani (2) Sat Siddhanta Martanda (3) Marut Shakti—a commentary on Prabhanjana (4) Sat Sneha Bhajan—a subcommentary on T.D.N.

   Many of his other works are unpublished. He was honoured with the title of 'Bharata Martanda—Supreme son of India'—by the Pandits and the learned.

The contribution to the philosophical literature of the Brahamin disciples is really a note worthy matter. For example—Nirbhayarama Bhatt's 'Adhikaranmala' on A. B., Vrajnatha Bhatta's 'Marichika' on A. B., Ichharama Bhatta's 'Pradipa' on A. B., and Ramakrishna Bhatta's 'Prakasha' on Shuddhadvaita Martanda are the main works.

CHAPTER XI

APPRECIATION

In the foregoing chapters, we have endeavoured to put before the readers, Vallabhacharya's work, in the realm of the Hindu philosophy and religion. In this chapter, we shall devote a few lines to estimate his work as a Hindu Philosopher and a religious teacher. Vallabhacharya was a Hindu, well versed in the Hindu learning and culture. Naturally his work of whatever kind, it may be, will be in the direction of the continuity of the traditional thought—philosophical, religious, ethical and cultural, which was handed down as a heritage from the Vedic times, through the Gita, the Brahma Sutras, the Puranas and the Smriti Works, although that thought did not keep the same tenour and rigidity in its onward march. It is believed by some foreign scholars that the Hindu Dharma is not progressive, because it has adhered to the same concept of the Reality, but it is not a correct picture. From the earliest period of its rise in the Vedic age, its nature has been dynamic and progressive. This is verified by the fact that its philosophical and religious thoughts of the Upanishada have received different constructions by thinkers of different times, in accordance with the changed condition of the Hindu Society. That is why, we have in India, different philosophical theories of Kevala-advaita (Monism) of Shamkara, Vishishthadvaita (Qualified non-dualism) of Ramanuja, Bhedabhedavada of Bhaskara, and Dwait-advaita (Non-dualism-cum-Dualism) of Nimbarka, Shuddhadvaita (Pure non-dualism) of Vallabhacharya and Dwaita-Dualism of Madhva. All these different schools of philosophy centre round the Upanishadic thought, which under the changed conditions, had to be expounded in new forms. Similarly, Monotheism and Polytheism or God as absolute and Personal are the Vedic concepts, but they are explained differently at different times. This proves that the Hindu Philosophy and Religion, do not run their course in a narrow groove, although they have their limitations, fixed with reference to the ultimate goal of reaching God. This is the chief peculiarity of the Hindu Dharma. The very idea of Dharma is to shape and sustain human life so as to make it effective in the real service of God, through which the final goal of unity with God is attained. Life is valued not for the opportunities of enjoyment of pleasures it affords, but for God-realisation and the Dharma points out the way to it. *Dharma* is a mediator between men and the Divinity. It aims at removing the barrier of ignorance that makes the soul forget its relation with God and facilitate the condition of their unity with Him. Although the original source of *Dharma* is the Vedas, which identifies *Dharma* with sacrifice, knowledge, austerity, self-control, worship and devotion etc., the original meaning has been understood in a new sense in the Gita and the Puranas and also by their commentators and the founders of sectarian religions. This explains that the Hindu Dharma is not rigid with water-tight compartments. It is plastic and subject to a change. Referring to this feature of the Hindu Dharma, Dr. Radhakrishnan makes this observation in his book 'Society and Religion—p. 113': "A living society must have both the power of continuity and the power of change. In a savage community, there is hardly any progress from one generation to another. Change is looked upon with suspicion and all human energies are concentrated on maintaining the status quo. In a civilised community, progress and change are the life-blood of its activity. Nothing is so subversive to society as a blind adherence to outworn forms and obsolete habits which survive by mere inertia. The Hindu view makes room for essential changes."

Vallabhacharya's teaching of the Dharma is to be understood and evaluated by bearing in mind the changed condition of Hindu life in the 15th century, under the impact of the Islamic Culture. He felt that the Hindu Dharma was almost on the verge of disruption. Its life and spirit were almost gone. It needed most effective medicine in the form of a new Dharma for its restoration and rejuvenation. Moved by this idea he began his work, with a missionary spirit. He was not a revolutionary thinker but a reformist with faith in comprise between the old and new. He favoured the new, but not at the cost of the old. In his view, the past had also its glorious history and it was a sin to discard it. If it did not suit under the new conditions, it should be reformed in parts, which are weak, without aiming a death blow at its strong parts. Considered in this light, his Dharma, no doubt, was a new one, although not a new one from the old form of the Vedas. It is only the re-oriented form of the old. The Hindu Dharma was badly in need of modification and this work was done by him with a bold face, by his sharp intellectual powers and profound erudiation and utmost zest. It is not wrong to say that the credit of rescuing the Hindu Dharma during the Muslim regime goes to him. He has shown the way to others, how to reform Dharma and renovate the social life.

Vallabhacharya's concept of Dharma reveals all the principal traits and characteristics, of the East.

The following are the chief points in which the East and the West differ, according to Dr. Radhakrishnan:

(1) The Western mind is rationalistic and ethical, positivist and practical, while the Eastern mind is more inclined to inward life and intuitive thinking. In the East, religion is more a matter of spiritual culture than of scholastic learning.

(2) The East prefers quietism to activism. The cultivation of the ulterior life and attainment of spiritual freedom is the aim of religion in the East.

(3) Religion in the West is confounded with a sort of nationalism but the religion in the East is free from this. It transcends nationality and tends to become universal.

(4) Religion in the West trains man for the citizenship of the State, that, in the East, holds up the ideal of making a man not only a citizen of this world but of the other world, or of the world of God.

(5) The West relies upon intellect or reason, the East on intuition, in searching truth.

Having regard to the religious condition obtaining in the country in general and the deterioration besieging the Hindu faith, he felt convinced that the religious concepts permeating the then Hindu Society needed re-thinking and modification, if the Hindu faith and culture were to survive. This was a hard task, but he applied his mind to it and arrived at the following conclusions, emphasised in his writings and the various sermons. The concepts no doubt were Vedic, but they had become static, obsolete and out-worn, and had fallen so low that they almost became functionless and hence valueless for a higher kind of life-the spiritual and also the divine life. His religious teaching was intended not only for the spiritualisation of life, but also for a better and higher purpose than that, namely, for the divinisation of life. Let us now indicate here briefly, how he interpreted those concepts and ideas:

(1) Action and Sacrifice:

According to the Hindu Philosophy and Religion, there are two possible ways of reaching the supreme Reality, one by rituals and the other by knowledge. In the Vedic age, action was identified with a sacrifice, a sort of ritualistic work, in which offerings were made to the Gods or God for propitiating them. These offerings were made by oblations into fire. The idea of such a sacrifice was very popular at one time but under the impact of the Buddhism and the Vedantism of Shankaracharya, it was openly condemned as being not useful for spiritual life, although the Mimansaka school lent a strong support to it. The Vedantists opposed it tooth and nail, asserting its futality as a means and insisted on Knowledge alone as a means.

The Samkhya and the Yoga did not accept sacrifice. They took Karma (action) in the sense of action and stated that every action is born of the ego-sense, which unless one desists from doing action, will become a cause of bondage for the soul. The Gita however no doubt understands the work in the Vedic sense of a sacrifice but it widens its meaning so as to include all kinds of works or duties—done selflessly and without attachment to the fruits. According to the Gita, a man has three kinds of duties (1) the duty unto himself and to his family (2) the duty unto the Society, and (3) the duty unto God. So every kind of activity —physical, psychical, spiritual or devotional, has all a significance of 'a sacrifice'. For what is a sacrifice? It is self-giving or renunciation of one's desires. Such sacrifice is not opposed to Knowledge in spirit. The Vedists and the Vedantists both are, according to the Gita, partially true. The Gita however tells us that Knowledge and work are not antagonistic to each other but are the two sides of a coin. Vallabhacharya accepts this view of the sacrifice and says that the sacrifice is of three kinds (1) that which is performed with a desire to obtain happiness in heaven (2) that which is performed for self-purification and the bliss of the spirit and (3) that performed for propitiation of God. The means for the first is work intended for God, for the second, knowledge of God and for the third, devotion or love for God. The first kind of sacrifice is called Adhibhautika —physical sacrifice to be done with ritualistic work or work in general, the second is called Adhyatamika or Spiritual sacrifice by knowledge or action and knowledge, and, the third kind is called Adhidaivika or the Divine one, to be done by devotion to or service of God. The last is the highest and Vallabhacharya supported that. Like Shamkara, he has not dismissed action from a religious life altogether. He has not only retained it but given it the due place as an auxiliary to knowledge and devotion. He discusses the worth and significance of action and sacrifice in religious life in his 'Tattva Dipa Nibandha —Part II'. It is a new meaning of the word 'sacrifice' in the sense that every kind of selfless work, done as God's work and for God, is a real sacrifice.

(2) **Tapas or penance:**

This is a means for religious life; but it is not to be restricted to the sense of physical torture, deliberately inflicted upon one-self, by a person as a means of having a better life in next birth or for the fulfilment of one's selfish desires, in this life by coercion on God. Such penance cannot be a religious discipline, and, it should be denounced. However, Vallabhacharya does not rule it out. He includes it as one of the five elements of Vidya, (Knowledge) by which ignorance is overcome. It is used in the sense of endurance of all kinds of sufferings physical or mental for a spiritual or a divine life. The sufferings felt by the soul on account of its separation from God is the real penance.

(3) **Knowledge:**

He modifies the meaning of knowledge not in the abstract sense of the knowledge of the Absolute, but the knowledge of personal God and of the soul's relation to Him. Like the Mimansakas, he does not consider it valueless or inferior to action but accepts its service in a religious life. The knowledge understood by him is the knowledge of the greatness of God, as a creator of the world. Such knowledge is essential as a pre-requisite for both spiritual and the divine life. Just as action is a power of God, so is knowledge. God's power of action is revealed through all kinds of physical and psychical activities. God's power of knowledge is revealed through all intellectual activities. Instead of becoming an obstacle, knowledge becomes instrumental in God's realisation, by pointing out its pit-falls as warning or cautioning against its dangers and giving guidance by suggesting appropriate remedy. Knowledge is not a theoretical study or knowing of the holy books but a practical application to the solution of the problem of living a divine life.

(4) **Worship:**

This was accepted by Ramanuja in the sense of a devotional act, which is a combination of sacrifice or rituals and knowledge. Worship as a means of God-realisation does not receive support from Vallabhacharya as preferrable to devotion. Instead of worship, he recommends Seva or Divine service of God. Worship in his opinion is soulless, and mechanical and as a mere daily routine. It lacks love. That cannot help one to realise God.

(5) **Prayer:**

He prefers hymns, chanted in praise of God to the prayer. Prayers are offered to God for fulfilment of one's desires. In hymns there is no such motive. Prayers should be offered as a spiritual discipline or a means for the redemption of the soul from falling into degenerated ways of life.

(6) **Heaven:** The idea of a heaven—an ideal place in the world other than this, is common to many religions. It is said that those who do noble actions in this life, go to the heaven. The Gita refers to this in Chapter VIII. Vallabhacharya accepts this ideal life, but its happiness is temporary. It lasts so long as the stock of merits is not exhausted. When it is exhausted, the soul has to come back to the world in some form. Vallabha's ideal life consists in God-realisation which is remaining permanently with God.

(7) **Devotion:** He is an advocate of the doctrine of Devotion as a means for a religious life, but he does not restrict its meaning to only devotion as a means. According to him it is an end too. It is not only hearing, reciting, and remembering God's glorious deeds or bowing and worshipping God, falling prostrate before God's image, accepting his servitude or passive surrender to him, but it is something more than this viz. Love. Without love for God, devotion is incomplete. It has its parallel with the love of a bride for the bridegroom.

(8) **Yoga:** Patanjali's idea of Yoga is defective according to him. It is only a negative way of controlling the predilections of mind. It aims at killling of one's senses. He suggests a better

way for mind-control, the way of Nirodha which is both non-attachment of the senses to the world, and attachment to God—a simultaneous process of mind control—a unique way. Nirodha is Yoga of a higher kind. He says that the Yoga is of three kinds: (1) Adhibhautika—practised for attainment of physical powers (2) Adhyatmika—practised for spiritual gains and (3) Adhidaivika—practised for the love of God. The Yoga of the last type alone is commendable according to him.

(9) **God:** According to him, God is not Absolute but personal. He is not 'Knowledge' as believed by Shamkaracharya, but He is Sat-Chit-Ananda—Being, consciousness Bliss or Truth Knowledge and Bliss. The Bliss or Love-form of God is Supreme Reality according to him.

(10) **The World and Mundane Existence:** These two are not the same. He points out the difference between the world and Sansara—mundane existence, perhaps for the first time in the history of Indian Philosophy. The world is as real as God. It is God's work. It is mundane existence, which is due to soul's ignorance, & is unreal. It is the result of the ego-sense. By ending it by the knowledge of God, this mundane existence is ended and the soul becomes free, but the world cannot be ended by the soul. It can be taken back by God by His own will.

(11) **The Soul:** According to Vallabhacharya, soul is not God. It is a part of God, representing God's consciousness. It has 'being' and 'consciousness' but not God's bliss. The souls are many. He divides them into three principal categories: (1) The worldly (2) The spiritual and (3) The Divine. The divine souls seek God by love alone.

(12) **Liberation:** It is not simply being free from worldly bondage or not returning to the world. It is not merging into God, supposed as Absolute, nor acquiring a state of likeness with God, or having the powers of God or residing in the place where God is present, but it is enjoying God's love by participating in His Bliss in the presence of God and in union with God, as a separate entity.

(13) **Re-birth:** He believes in re-birth relating or re-app earance of the soul in a new body after death. But following the Upanishadas, the Gita and the Brahma Sutras, he thinks that it

is not that all the souls are re-born. It is only the embodied souls devoted to the performance of sacrifices that are born again. The spiritual have no re-birth. They are absorbed in Brahman's consciousness or stay with Him permanently in union with Him. Again he insists that, one should care more for the re-birth of the soul in this body, rather than for birth in a new body after death. The spirituality and the divnity instead of the worldliness is the characteristic mark indicative of the soul's re-birth in this body. It means that the soul's human nature must be transformed into spiritual and divine nature, otherwise it would not acquire fitness for God-realisation. Souls who are self-engrossed, have no higher destiny than repeated births and deaths.

(14) **Vairagya:** It is not digust or repulsion merely. Such *Vairagya* does not receive Vallabhacharya's approval. It is turning away from world to experience God's love. It is not passive and negative. It is not merely quietism. It is prompted not by disgust for the world but by love for God. It is, no doubt, a state of the soul's indifference to all kinds of worldly passions, but at the same time this indifference is due to love for God. Shunning all kinds of worldly pleasures and duties, a man imbued with true conception of *Vairagya,* seeks joy of love of God, through his senses and mind. He is a seeker of bliss of God, by love of God, and for that end, he discards all worldly pleasures and duties.

Vallabhacharya preached and taught religion of the universal type of the cosmopolitan character, and acceptable to all sundry eclectic type of men. Not only this, but it was higher than that, having for its purpose 'God-realisation'. It was not a sectarian religion in its narrow sense, though later on, like all other religious systems, his religion came to be dubbed as a sectarian religion in an organised form. Granted that, its present form is sectarian, still it must be admitted that it is free from sinister tendencies of the sectarian religion. It is open to all men and women of all classes and although its supreme doctrine is 'love for God', it teaches love to humanity also. The love for God is to be achieved through human love i.e. the love for all people living in the world, irrespective of all differences. To love men is to love God and vice versa. Hence, although love for God is supreme, it is inclusive of human love. This feature makes it a universal religion. It is not theology only but practical discipline also, shaping a man's behaviour in relationship to other people, as a social being, a citizen of the world and also a man of the Kingdom of God.

The main purpose of religion is the restoration of the lost relationship between the individual and the Eternal. Dr. Radhakrishnan expresses the same view in his book-'Religion and Science'. Vallabhacharya's religion has that purpose. Its essence is not in the dogmas and creeds, nor in rites and ceremonies which are done mechanically, but in the deepest feeling of love running high for God. Religion is not to be demonstrated but felt and experienced inwardly. Its aim is the vision of the supreme or an unquenchable yearning for contact with God or acquiring identity with the divine. This is the view of St. Paul Augustine and Plotinus. Religiosity is the sense of God. To be religious means to have the sense of God in all our thoughts, feelings and doings. The following extract from Dr. Radhakrishnan's book 'Religion and Socience' is worth quoting here :—

"Any serious pursuit of ideas, any search after conviction, any adventure after virtue, arises from resources whose name is religion. The search of the mind for beauty, goodness and truth is the search for God. The child nursing at the breast of its mother, the illiterate savage gazing at the numberless stars, the scientist in his laboratory studying life under a microscope, the poet meditating in solitude on the beauty and pathos of the world, the ordinary man standing reverently before a star-lit sky, the Himalayan heights or a quiet sea or before the highest miracle of all, a human being who is both great and good, they all possess dimly the sense of the eternal, the feeling for heaven (i.e. for God)". Religion dominates everything. It is all pervading sense of the consciousness of God's being present everywhere. Thus the religious feeling is not an isolated passing phase of the mind but is all pervading, dragging to one's mind the presence of God in all.

The worth of Vallabhacharya's religion lies in teaching the sense of God in all, and, that is his greatest contribution to the world-religion. It is a religion of love, and as such it is for all times and for the people of all the countries. It transcends the territorial bounds. It is the religion founded upon a broad principle of love for Humanity and God.

When men loved their fellow-creatures and God, they were happy. The world was not so restless and unhappy as it is today. It is because it has discarded religion from the world's affairs. There are religions at present, but they have become sectarian, and, therefore unable to achieve world-unity by love. The regard for religion has been diminishing from generation to generation and there are several factors to account for it, viz. Materialism, Seculiarism, Humanism, Scientific expansion, Agnosticism, Scepticism, Escapism, Love for nature, Economic discontent etc. The distemper has gone very deep resulting into disorganisation and disruption of the world-order. Although education has far advanced, science has made wonderful progress, and there is industrial development on a large scale in the world, yet the problem of the world unity has not only become insoluble but is becoming more and more complex. The reason, according to Dr. Radhakrishnan is the lack of religious feeling. He sounds a note of warning against this in his 'Kalki' and says 'the only remedy against this is the revival of religious feeling.' This is an important point. What cannot be solved by political ideology or by any thing else, can be solved only by religion. But it is not the sectarian religion. It is the type of religion which teaches both the universal and the divine love and such a religion has been taught in the past by Vallabhacharya's Vaishnavism. It is a religion of essentially love for God, which is both humanistic and divine. It teaches one to love all men and reach God's love through human love and ultimately experience only God's love i.e. the divine love, which is known as Humanism. According to him, it is part of divine love. In the final stage of the divine love, the aspirant of the divine love transcends human love. It is this regard for humanism that impelled him to pay attention to social conditions of the people of his time, which he improved without any disturbance.

Vallabhacharya's religious consciousness is a harmonious fusion of thought, feeling and Will, and this is a chief characteristic which differentiates his religion from other religions. Thought means 'knowledge' of God, feeling 'love' and Will for 'action in the form of Divine service.' These three—knowledge, feeling and Will—are chief components of the mind, no doubt, but Vallabhacharya makes feeling i.e. love alone as chief for the goal of religious consciousness, namely God-realisation, which is to be achieved only by love. It must be supported by Knowledge of God and action, which must find inlet, through Divine service. That is, thought or intellect and Will must co-operate and play a second fiddle to love which is a supreme feeling. There are other feelings such as anger, lust, greed, pride, etc. and any one of these also can be utilised in God-realisation, provided it is directed to God, but the best inlet of expression of God experience is love which is not lust or sexual love, but the supreme kind of selfless love only for God in its highly sublimated form. Vallabhacharya does not rule out Action and Knowledge like other Hindu philosophers.

In the history of the Hindu philosophy one remarkable thing to be noted is that it never questions or doubts the existence of God. It starts its philosophical speculation accepting the belief in the existence of God as an axiomatic truth. Its ultimate goal being God-realisation or liberation, it does not indulge in reasoning or argumentation for proving the existence of God. God is self-existent. He does not stand in need of a proof for maintaining His existence. The Hindu philosophers rely upon the authority of the scriptures, which are the records of the experiences of the sages in God-realisation and these experiences were intuitional only. Charvaka was an atheist. He repudiated God's existence on the plea that if God exists, then He must be perceived. The Buddhists and the Jainas have not considered the question of God's existence. The Vijnanavadis, a school of the Buddhists points out to consciousness as an ultimate reality but even that does not conform to the commonly received God-idea. The Samkhya has not thought of God. To it Matter is the ultimate principle. The Yoga system has felt a need of God only for concentration of mind as a temporary phase. Jaimini replaces Work for God. The Nyaya-Vaisheshika schools have not only introduced God-idea, but later on, furnished proofs, based upon reason for the existence of God. But the proof given by them proved only God as efficient cause of the world and not a material one. The Western philosophers like Descartes, Leibniz, Hegal have attempted to prove for the existence of God upon reason, —intellectual knowledge by the cosmological, teleological and ontological arguments. But these fail to carry conviction because they prove the existence of God as an efficient cause and leave out God as a material cause. The Rationalists do not think of the material cause as God. God is but both the material and efficient cause. Aristotle's God is unmoved Prime Mover, an entelechy, a Supreme force and represents four-fold cause-material, efficient, formal and final. His view is more acceptable than that of the Rationalists, although he does not consider God as the creator. Kant supports the existence of God on the moral ground. In the absence of a supreme moral Governor, there will be chaos and confusion in the religious, social and political life. So we need God who will watch our moral actions. Again in his view, God is Absolute and not a creator of the world but this does not appeal to us. Descarte's argument 'Cogito ergo sum'—'I think, therefore I exist' also is not impressive. He means to say, "I have an idea of God, therefore God must have existence." But here one fails to understand whether his thought of God depends upon prior existence of God or God's existence on prior existence of his thought. According to Plato, it is thought or idea which is prior to existence, but Descartes would make existence prior to the idea of God. Such an attempt to prove the existence of God rationally has no solid basis. Even the arguments of the empiricists who prove God by sense-data, have led to the position of reducing God to idea or mind or matter only. The Vedantins of India do not bother themselves with vain arguments in support of the existence of God. They rely upon the scriptures and believe in the self-evident existence of God by faith. Vallabhacharya follows them and says that the existence of God is supported by the Shrutis which explain God's nature and His creation and the way to realise God. He is interested in God-realisation, in explaining his conception of God and pointing out the way for God-realisation. The central teaching of Vallabhacharya's religion is the direct apprehension of God and through it, experienc of God by love just as one feels the presence of air by breathing it, so one feels the presence of God by experiencing Him. The experience of God is as real as seeing a green leaf or the sun. The experiencing of God is identical with the experience of matter, life or mind, the only difference is that the experience of the latter, is through senses or intellect, that of the former by intuitions. It is self-established, self-evident and self-luminous. The sacred books affirm that God cannot be experienced by intellect but by God's grace. That means establishing the personal relationship with God, which has a variety of ways of experience. The philosophers in the West try to experience God by intellect, but the *Vedantic* philosophers of the East prefer intuition to intellect as a mode of experiencing God. Intuitive knowing is different from the conceptual knowledge. It is non-sensuous, immediate or *Aparoksha* knowledge. The truth apprehended by intuition is self evident, and does not require verification. It is individual. Kant and Bergson reject intellect in favour of intuition. Hegel, however, lays emphasis on reason as a means of experiencing God. Dr. Radhakrishnan, criticising Hegel, says that he was wrong in his view, because he resorts to the logical way of an approach to Reality, ignoring the elements of feeling, will and psychical inwardness. Vallabhacharya does not resort to logical way for the apprehension of God. According to him, a man is not only a thinking-being. As an individual soul, the soul knowing its relation to God, must aspire for the union with God to be achieved, not by mere intellectual knowledge. The service of intellect is recognised in Divine life, as by it, one will learn that God is an ultimate principle, but then to experience God, the aid of intuition must be sought. Vallabhacharya insists upon the truth of the experience of God which is not vague and transitory, but clear, crystal-like, of a permanent kind to the person who has got the experience. Intuitive experience for him means esperience of God by disinterested, single minded and most formidable love for God. God-realisation is the chief end of all Hindu philosophical and religious schools and not only the acquisition of spirituality. Although there are different methods, such as meditation, moral life and mystical experience, the method of mystical experience is thought the best. In this method also some lay stress on Action, some on Knowledge and some on Devotion. Vallabhacharya's mystical method consists of the elements of devotion and God's grace. God is to be experienced in internal consciousness as well as in the external world. The Gita[1] mentions some marks of a person who realises God namely, Supersensuousness i.e. intuition and concentration. It is an experience from within and does not depend upon senses or intellect. The bliss that it gives is not the animal or intellectual pleasure but it is something transcendental, and divine in nature. Such a state of experience is continuous through out the whole life. Vallabhacharya following the Gita says that God can be realised by all categories of God-seekers who are specially privileged to receive God's grace. In its absence, to acquire fitness for His grace He should render daily service to Him, and practise devotional acts accompanied by Love for Him. Mere devotion is not enough. A devotee must think of God, and God alone in his love for God, selflessly. God will take possession of his mind and intellect so that in all his thoughts and feelings he will turn away from the worldly objects and turn to God and become divine. God as a mark of his love for the soul, taking pity on it, moves towards it and finally blesses it by admitting it to His presence. This is the meaning of God-realisation. It is not a dream for it can be practically realised, but the only condition is that the soul must become divine. Vallabhacharya's philosophy and religion aim at the attainment of divine life.

---

[1] B. G. II. 9-12-16

Mind: Commonly it is believed that mind and matter are opposed to each other. A lot of literature has been published in the West on the nature of mind, and there are many schools of psychollogy treating the problem of mind. Before mind came to be recognised as a separate entity. it was identified with the soul or spirit, but Descartes differentiated it from the soul. The old psychological school known as faculty psychology believed the mind to be composed of three faculties of thought, feeling and Will. The functional psychology doubted the existence of mind as a separate entity, but inferred it from its functions. The Gestalt school regarded it as a whole, without the divisions or parts. Macdaugal defined it as a bundle of instincts. Freud, Addler and Jung brought to the notice of the world that, what is known as Mind is not one. It has three levels of consciousness—the conscious, the subconscious and the unconscious. According to this school, the mind is not essentially conscious, but is like an ice-berg floating on the sea with most of its part submerged under water. The mind, that we know, is only a fragment of it. Its major portion is unknown to us. This scholar makes 'Id' a pleasure principle which gives rise to the ego.

The behaviourist school rejects, 'mind' altogether. It is physiological. It is identified with brain. The Western philosophy used the word mind in the sense of consciousness. Descartes differentiated it from matter. Spencer brought both under substance and Leibniz under Monad. Locke described it as ideas and denied matter. Berkeley apprehended it not separate from ideas. Hume established that it was all matter and not mind. Kant accepted both as separate but placed consciousness or soul above both. Generally in the Western philosophy, the word mind was loosely used for consciousness, but later on, it came to be distinguished from consciousness, self or soul. Indian philosophy is very clear on the relation between mind and consciousness or soul. They are not identical, but separate entities. It places soul between mind and God. Mind in common parlance is supposed to be a source or a reservoir of all phenomena of mental life such as thoughts, feelings, desires, Wills, imagination, memory and instincts.

The Shuddhadvaita School regards Mind as an organ of Knowledge in addition to five commonly accepted organs with three aspects—physical, spiritual and divine. In its physical aspect, it has to be controlled by discipline. It is a controller of senses and is to be controlled by spirit. It has also four levels of functioning (1) the mind proper (2) intellect (3) ego and (4) Chitta—awareness. Desires, taking resolves, impulses, doubts, faith, patience, shame, fear, efforts etc. are its qualities. In all, it has mainly 16 energies each sub-divided into a number of ways. The Mimansakas regard it pervasive. To Vallabhacharya, it is atomic. The Buddhists, though believe it as atomic, consider it as eternal. The Samkhyas take it as an evolute of *Prakriti* but Vallabhacharya thinks it as evolved or manifested from God and therefore divine in nature. This has the support from the Gita, (VII-4), where it is said that there are five elements—earth, water, fire, air and the sky. Intellect, mind and ego are evolved from the lower aspect of Prakriti (Nature) and the soul from the higher aspect of the same. This means that just as the soul is manifested from God's conscious aspect, the mind is manifeested from the unconscious aspect. It is (*Karana*)—an instrument of the soul for its freedom from worldly bondage and attainment of God. The relation of the soul and the mind is explained on the analogy of the master and the servant, the soul being the Master and the mind a servant. The Gita truly says, 'the Mind is the cause of a man's worldly bondage or its release from it.' The soul's rising to God or remaining in the worldly state depends upon the training of the mind and its use by the soul in God's service. The soul is no doubt the Governor of the mind and its immediate master, but really speaking, the mastership enjoyed by the soul over the mind is on behalf of God, so that whatever service the soul expects of the mind, is not for its own pleasure but for God's sake.

The Gita (VI-34) compares state of mind with a reservoir—a deep pit and wind. Its nature is unsteady, and it is very difficult to control. Its comparision with a sea of surging waves suggests its restlessness, turbulence, violence, impeturosity and inaccessibility. It requires a great amount of efforts to control the mind. If controlled cautiously, patiently, and tactfully, the mind will be a docile and a good servant. The mind by itself is not bad. It is divine in origin. So it should be employed in the service of the Divine. Only the devotee who knows the soul's relation to God will direct his mind God-ward and by continual efforts will acquire fitness for reaching the goal of God-realisation. The mind instead of being a faithful servant, and a friend of the soul, will dominate the soul and not only will block up the soul's upward passage to God, but will push it back in the mire of the world so that it would never rise again. Western psychology explains the nature of mind, but does not show a reliable way of controlling it, but the Indian psychology is applied psychology, and shows how to control or check or change it. Both Psychology of the East and the West emphasises the fact that the mind has certain desires, lying deep below its surface, which when come out, shape a man's behaviour in a particular way and make him a good or bad person in the society. The Freuidians tell us that the desires of men are natural and they must be allowed free expression. The Vedantins and Patanjali say that for a spiritual life, the natural desires by which the mind binds the soul to the world must be annihilated. The Gita does not recommend this negative and suicidal way. No doubt some control is necessary, but it should not be such that may cause the annihilation of the desires and paralyse the normal function of the mind. In the development of spiritual and religious life the desires have their role to play. They are not to be supposed as stumbling blocks to our progress. Only they are to be given proper direction of God-realisation. Freudians suggest methods of cannalisation, sublimation, platonisation etc. by which these can be transformed for a better and nobler cause.

Vallabhacharya has suggested the method of the Divine service in which all the desires of men become desires for God's love. The desires directed towards God will not be for worldly happiness but for the enjoyment of God's bliss. The method of divine service —Nirodha—is superior to the Yoga of Patanjali. It is not coercion on the mind, but training it. This training is given to the mind through knowledge, devotion, renunciation and the divine service. Yoga method is no doubt a good and practical method, but (1) It is coercive (2) and does not lead to the union of the soul with God, who is Love and Bliss. It is the way of meditation in which in its last stage, the meditator loses consciousness of the world and becomes merged into the object of meditation (God), but does not enjoy the bliss of God, which is to be enjoyed by its mind with its desire for God's love. Vallabha's Nirodha is not only free from these defects, but it is superior to it and practicable by all.

Although Thought, Feeling and Will are the three faculties of the mind, Vallabha does not divide the mind into these parts. They are so organised into the constitution of the mind that they have no separate existence. They are like three facets of one thing. Seekers of God, according to their training, may use any of them individually or all of them. Vallabha's view is to use them all making feeling (love) predominant. Thought means knowledge, feeling means Bhakti and action. For divine love, knowledge of God is necessary and action in the form of divine service is essential. As a means of God-realisation, Vallabhacharya's Nirodha is a unique contribution.

His contribution to the concept of God is also unique. In the Upanishadas, the idea of God is expressed by such terms as Brahman, Atman, Parmatman, Isvara, Akshara, Purushottama, Para Purusha. The Gita uses mostly besides Brahman, the words Akshara, Purushottama, and also Vasudeva and also Krishna. Vallabhacharya accepts all these words for God but prefers the word 'Krishna' to connote all the ideas concerning God. Shankara distinguishes between Brahman and Ishvara. The former according to him is Absolute and the later Personal. It is the later that is understood as God by him. Thus there are two Gods, Principal and Secondary. Ramanuja believes in one God who is both. So does Vallabhacharya. The ideas about God in the western philosophy are described in Chapter II.

The latest concept of God in the West is that of God as the Holy or Noumenal by Dr. Otto, based on the God-idea of the Gita in the XIth Chapter of the Gita.

Vallabhacharya's God is both Absolute (Unmanifest) and personal (manifest). The world and the souls are His manifestations, evolved from His Nature. The world is God's own creation and is real. All is God because God is manifested in all the beings and is immanent in them and is at the same time transcendental. He can be experienced by love. This means that a God-seeker must love all creatures as God's beings or forms and feel His presence everywhere, and thereby experience God's love which must transcend all other loves. God is personal in the sense that His personality is though like the personality of the human beings, is divine. His attributes are also divine. He manifests the world and the souls for His play or joy. In every phenomenon of a men's life or the events of the world, there is the Will of God. The differences in the world are due to His Will, and for His joy. One should not therefore, hate the evil but regard it as due to His will, which is not capricious or arbitrary, but purposive and necessary for His play. If we think of God in the sinner and the wicked, we shall not hate him. A sinner is also necessary in the world-play to suit His plan. By so thinking, a seeker of God will rise above the world, regarding this world as the Kingdom of God. Vallabhacharya's Shuddhadvaita not only teaches us this, but also to love and experience Him in His love-form and to enjoy Bliss with Him. This is the gist of his philosophy. The final appreciation of the devotee's love is indicated by God's grace and participation in the divine Bliss. In that condition, there remains not a trace of worldliness in him. It is a new form of the soul, even in the embodied state.

Dr. Otto does not disagree with the Absolutists, but says that for mystical experience, the Absolute is of no use. The Absolute being rational, is a different kind of God, who can be felt or experienced only through intuition. He designates God by naming Him the "Holy" which is not rational. It is beyond the categories of the True, the good and the Beautiful, as typified in the Absolute. This Holy is an apriori category. His philosophy Numen 'signifies supreme divine power lying inside God who is beyond the scope of reason. The mystical experience cannot be explained by reason. God as Holy is a complex of the feelings of mystery, wonder, power, terror, reverence and joy. Otto thinks that the God of the Gita is God as the Holy—and not the Absolute. He is wholly transcendent. It is a peculiar combination of a personal God and the world. The Holy is to be experienced by the Advaita Bhakti in which a devotee becomes merged in God. Although Otto's idea of the Holy, some what approximates Kant's idea of God as the sublime, both differ from each other in experiencing God. Kant's way of experiencing Him is by the categorical, Imperative and that of Otto, by submission to the divine Will. The Absolute cannot be experienced. Vallabhacharya also says the same thing. His God is personal. Although Being-Consciousness and Bliss, it is the Bliss-form of God as Rasa that has to be experienced by God-seeker. This is a new concept in the history of the Indian as well as the Western philosophy. Concepts of God as representing Truth, Goodness and Beauty have prevailed in the domain of philosophy; but Vallabhacharya alone has brought to the notice of the world, the concept of God as Bliss (Ananda) or Blissful (Ananda-maya). Vallabhacharya's philosophy is intended to make a man, not only a moral man but a divine, fit for the enjoyment of God's Bliss.

Vallabhacharya was realist, out and out. According to him, everything is real. The effect i.e. the world is emanation or manifestation of God and like God it is also real. All that appears in the world is not phenomenal. The ultimate principle is not Absolute or attributeless. He, believing in the personal God, is a monotheist and not a monist. God's personality is divine. Truth, Beauty and goodness are only his divine attributes. Although he believes in the plurality of souls, he is not a pluralist because the souls are non-different from God, but fragments of God's consciousness. He approves of 'All is God' but he is not a pantheist because he holds that God is transcendal also. He does not identify the world with God but says that the world having been manifested from God's 'being' aspect, it is God's part. Nor does his transcendal view of God make him a panetheist, as he believes in the immanence of God. Although God, according to him is a maker of the world, he is not a deist, because the God of the deist has nothing to do with the government and order of the world. That God, like a clock-maker, having created the world, leaves it alone.

Vallabhacharya's God is not only a clock-maker but a clock itself. Every part in the mechanism of the clock is also God. He is neither an Absolute idealist, nor a personal idealist, but thoroughly a realist. He does not make any difference between Absolute Truth and Relative truth. All truth is truth. The relative truth is also God's truth. The three kinds of truths—the Inherent, the Correspondent and the pragmatist are not different truths—but revelations of one truth but not reflections because all the truths are pervaded by the Divinity.

The problem of Free-will versus Determinism has received much attention of the moralists, the psychologists and the philosophers in the West. The Free-willists are of opinion that a man is free to do actions by his will. The Determinists, on the contrary, suppose that a man has no independent Will of his own. His actions are pre-determined by environments or fate and he is not responsible for the results. Much can be said against both. If a man does something by his own will, why does he fail in the execution of his plan? The best of plans very often come to naught. This means, that a man may work, with reference to a specific motive, and yet, he is absolutely powerless in the matter of its result. We have to suppose that the result must lie with some unknown power such as Fate or God. The proverb 'A man proposes and God disposes' supports this. Vallabhacharya is a Determinist, as he believes that men's actions are already determined by God. The soul, as the 'Brahma Sutras' says, is a doer, but does what has God willed the soul to do it. Every action of soul springs from its will but it has no independent Will. Its will is God-given. So the soul's self-will is really speaking God's will. By that God-given will, a man does a particular action. He bears its fruits, believing that it is so willed by God. In the Gita, when Arjuna hesitates to fight against his enemies, Krishna tells him—"Arjuna! You are afraid of the consequences of killing your own men, but I advise you to fight, even if fighting involves killing. You should know that the war and its result have been both determined by Me. No one can stop it. You are only to become an instrument of My will." Thus Gita supports Determinism. The Upanishadas also teach it. It is stated there that God impels those men to do noble deeds, whom He wishes to raise higher and to do ignoble deeds, whom He wishes to degrade. Rise or fall is not the result of their free will. So good or bad actions are due to God's will along with their consequences. Vallabhacharya makes a man's will subordinate to God's will. According to Shamkaracharya, both the views are wrong, because neither soul's will or God's will has real existence. It is due to Maya only.

It is likely that Vallabhacharya's concept of religion may be objected to by the Humanists, because, according to him, the aim of religion is God-realisation, but it is not in contradiction to the humanist view of religion. His religion does comprise humanist belief also. Humanism is solely concerned with man and not with God. It asserts that the religious activity must be with reference to man. It aims at the better relations of man with man in the society, improved social and economic conditions conducing to general welfare and prosperity and the ultimate harmonious interrelation of all men with one another, not only in a particular society in which a man lives, but with all men in the world. It believes in international integration only. Despite its best intentions, humanism forgets one important fact that human life has its origin from the Divinity which is above all human beings. Humanism makes a man its centre instead of God, and directs all its energies to the uplift of man. It is a good ideal standing on a weak base. The Gita says that all beings have their origin in God. Dr. Radhakrishnan supports it in his 'An indealist view of Life,'[1] by affirming that the roots of a man's being are in the unseen and eternal and his destiny is not limited to the duration of his life on earth. Aristotle also says that each man, inclined to do social service, must have the sense of the presence of God, guiding us in all our experiences of life. So humanism without this sense cannot take us far in the establishment of world-peace and happiness of the whole mankind. The social good cannot improve the social condition by humanism alone. Durkheim advocates social morality as a substitute of religion, but he forgets the fact of man's relation with God, which is a fundamental fact to be grasped, if progress towards peace and harmony all over the world is our purpose. In the words of Dr. Ṛadhakrishnan, even socialism, which is supposed to be an ideal form of humanism, cannot remove human selfishness. It cannot free men from death. For this reason Kant pleaded for theism. He argues that since a good man is often defeated on earth, we need a super-human power to adjust virtue and happiness. The difference between humanism and religion is that the former is concerned with values, the later relates value to Reality.

---

[1] (P. 66)

The Hindu Religious teachers relate religion to God. Vallabhacharya relates not only religion but every activity of life, individual or social, to God. He teaches, after the Gita, that there is God in 'All' and that all things animate or inanimate have emanated from God. The world and all conscious forms are God's forms. As God is in 'All', love for 'All' and mankind is also love for God. Thus, humanism in Vallabhacharya's philosophy is not different from religion. It is rather a phase in religious life and his religion in this sense is also universal, for, it teaches oneness of all beings. When a man sees a beggar, he must feel that he is an image of God and, therefore, must be helped. If an enemy attacks him, he must take him as an image of God and love him. Vallabha's religion is founded upon love for God which is also expressed through love for every creature as it is giving love to all, freely in the name of God, without hoping for any return. We should love others even though they do not love us, and forgive their faults disinterestedly. It delights in giving, sacrificing one's own interests and suffering. A truly religious man lives in peace with all and appreciates rather than judges others. While devoted to social good or any charitable or altruistic work, he does not become conscious of it, but of God and God alone, who inspires him to do good. He develops in him all the divine virtues mentioned in the Gita (Ch. XVI), and yet his ideal is not for honour but to live the life in communion with God. Vallabhacharya's religion does not teach that the worldly life is unreal and that one should renounce it and live far away from the world contemplating on God. He asks us to take life as it is and stick to it and live it, believing it as the gift of God. He should live in the world and cultivate love for God, both by service to humanity and to God. On a lower plane, a man must maintain his contact with the world by doing whatever good acts he could do, by any means at his disposal under the guidance and supervision of God; but when he reaches the higher plane of spiritual life the contact with the world should be severred and that with God should be established because the ultimate purpose of religious life is the transcendence of all the earthly values and aspiring for the unity with

God. God-realisation is to be reached through social or universal love, equality to all creatures, freedom to all, cooperation, tolerance, non-exploitation and non-distinction of the races and classes, non-violence, non-aggression etc. mentioned in the Gita (XVI—1-2). In the words of Mahatma Gandhi the crowning-virtue of humanism is love to all. Considered this way, there is no conflict between the universal and the divine love in Vallabhacharya's system.

It is wrong to misconstrue his religion with theology. Theology demands conformity to the rituals or certain practices. Vallabha's religion concerns with the attainment of God's love. The theologians lay stress on the externals of religion and ignore internal spirit. They teach religious duty with reference to the body and not with reference to the soul or God. Vallabhacharya's religion concerns the attainment of the divinity only. It does not seek liberation even. It is not for spiritual life only but even for a higher life—the Divine life of participation in God's bliss in union with Him. He does not prescribe any rules of conduct for a religious life, except purity and devotion to God, signlemindedly. There are no ritualistic injunctions or prohibitions, nor any prescriptions as in the Vedic works. The essence of his religion is love for God.

The essence of religion according to him lies in a synthesis of the cognitive, the aesthetic and the ethical sides of our life, because God is truth, goodness and Beauty. For God-realisation, they must be organically blended together. We must know God, love and render service to God. This means in the words of Dr. Radhakrishnan, "We require the three together, Cognitive illumination, emotional stability and practical power, inward light, ineffable beauty and strong fire, a life in which the three become closely bound up with one another. . . . The religious man traces the values of truth, goodness and beauty to a common background, God, the Holy, who is both without and within us. The truth we discern, the beauty we feel and the good we strive after is the God we apprehend as believers." Vallabhacharya asserts the same laying emphasis on love as a chief means of God-realisation.

The Western Reader will appreciate Vallabhacharya's teachings, only if he remembers that he was one of the greatest Hindu religious teacher with absolute faith in the supreme, teaching of the

Vedas that God is Love, and through love He is attained. His religious consciousness revealed all the characteristics of eastern religious teacher as pointed out by Dr. Radhakrishnan (East and West in Religion-page 48). "The Western mind is rationalistic and ethical, positivist and practical, while the Eastern mind is more inclined to inward life and intuitive thinking. The West is interested in the material prosperity, whereas the East in the spiritual wisdom. The west makes social life as an ideal of life, the East, the God-seeking life. The West is concerned with this world, the East in the other world. The West believes in action, the East in retirement. The West will solve its problems by intellect, the East by intuition. The West is logical, the East is intuitive. The West is pragmatic, interested only in the present, the East is concerned with the future destiny of man or life after death. The West is more practical, the East is more mystical. The East believes in spiritual culture more than in scholastic learning. The aim of the eastern religions is securing the salvation of the soul, whereas in the West, generally this is in the background." If Vallabhacharya's religious teaching is viewed from this point, the Western readers will hesitate in pronouncing a hasty judgment on his teachings.

Regarding Vallabhacharya's interpretation of the Supreme Reality of the Upanishads, we may remark here that although Shamkaracharya took cudgels against the Shunyavada and the Vignanavada of Buddhism, he does not impress us as the correct interpreter; because he had asserted the same truth of the Buddhistic schools, according to some, in explaining Indeterminate Brahman, ignoring personal theism of the Vedas. Ramanuja improved upon his teaching by attempting a harmonious contribution of absolutism with personal theism. He succeeded in giving us the best type of monotheism pregnant with immanentism; but he conceived the relation of the universe and the souls to God as being those between the attributes and the substance. But if they are attributes they must have existence independent of the substance, but Ramanuja does not accept that. He believes God as underlying substratum of the universe and the souls. This is not acceptable logically. Vallabhacharya has, therefore, in order to avoid the risk of falling into a fallacious reasoning, taking clue direct from the Upanishads, the Gita and the Brahma

Sutras, expresses their relations as between the parts and the whole. It is this, that has raised his reputation as being the most logical interpretor consistent to Upanishadic teaching.

We may quote here the following passages from Dr. Bhandarkar's book Vaishnavism and Shaivism, estimating properly Vallabhacharya's interpretation about God as transcendental and immenant. After giving in brief the doctrines of Ramanuja, Nimbarka, Vallabha, Madhava and Shri Kantha, he remarks- "Thus most of these schools avoid the pantheism of Spinoza and the incompatibility between God's development into the world and his transcendence, by holding that the rudiments of the material and the spiritual world associated with God as His characteristics or as His body or as His power, only undergo the development, He Himself remaining pure." Vishnuswamy and Vallabha admitting as they do, the development of Purushottama (God) into the world and at the same time His transcendency follow Badarayana.

We shall indicate in brief a few fundamental principles of Vallabhacharya's religious teaching. They are: (1) Selfexistence of God (2) The nature of God not the Absolute but Personal (3) God as Truth, Goodness and Love or Being—Consciousness—Bliss (Sach-chida-Anand) (4) Reality of the world which is the 'Being' aspect of God (5) Plurality of the souls and their relation to God as of the parts to the whole (6) Immanence and transcendence of God. (7) God-realisation the goal of life (8) Devotion as a chief means of God-realisation (9) Doctrine of Grace (10) Union of the soul with God and his participation in the bliss of God (11) Restoration of God-like state of the soul in liberation (12) Preference of Divine service as a householder to the ascetic life. (13) Optimistic view of life. (14) Absolute surrender to God.

We conclude this chapter with the following extract from Shri P. B. Patwari's preface to the 'Divine Fluitist' with a hope that it will inspire the younger generation to study Vallabhacharya's works and derive lessons of spiritual life therefrom to reach the basic aims of life.

"Shri Vallabhacharya (1535 V.S.—1587 V.S.) philosopher of distinction, was gifted with the super genius characteristic of India's great philosophers. His masterly and numerous treatises on philosophy have not much spread beyond his followers, but once the curtain is raised, it is certain that he will shine out as one of the most resplendent luminaries in the galaxy of the world philosophers. At the time, India was passing through agonising turmoil and confusion, both social and cultural, he came to the people with an enchanting and fresh message of the glory and grandeur of life. His influence was such that he succeeded in introducing a faith based on the principles of universal love, beauty, joy and oneness of life. He introduced Krishna, the incarnation of God, as the manifestation of the Divine Love and grace and revolutionised religious conceptions by welcoming all into his faith, irrespective of caste, community, creed or sex."

A Synoptical Survey
of
Some Important works of the Shuddhadvaita School.

SECTION II

(WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE WORKS BY SHRI VALLABHACHARYA, SHRI VITHALESHJI, SHRI GOKULNATHJI, SHRI HARIRAIJI, SHRI PURUSHOTTAMJI, SHRI GIRADHARJI, SHRI YOGI GOPESHVARAJI, AND SHRI GATTULALAJI.)

◆

TO REALISE GOD, ONE MUST ACQUAINT ONESELF WITH THE SCRIPTURAL KNOWLEDGE WHICH IS THE WORD-FORM OF GOD. THOUGH HIMSELF SELFLUMINOUS GOD IS REVEALED BEFORE HIS DEVOTEE ONLY BY THE SCRIPTURAL LITERATURE IMPARTING KNOWLEDGE OF GOD.

VALLABHACHARYA.

पुष्टिमार्गें हरेर्दास्यं धर्मोऽर्थो हरिरेव हि ।
कामो हरेर्दिदृक्षैव मोक्षः कृष्णस्य चेद् ध्रुवम् ।।

श्रीवल्लभाचार्याः ।

IN 'PUSHTI MARGA' RELIGION CONSISTS IN THE SERVICE TO GOD. GOD IS THE WEALTH TO BE ACQUIRED AND GOD SHOULD BE THE OBJECT OF THE STRONG DESIRE. REAL LIBERATION CONSISTS IN LIVING FOR THE GOD IN ALL RESPECTS.

वृथालापक्रियाध्यानं सर्वथैव परित्यजेत् ।।

श्रीवल्लभाचार्याः ।

IDLE TALK, FUTILE ACTION, AND USELESS MENTAL PURSUITS IN ALL RESPECTS SHOULD DEFINITELY BE GIVEN UP.

स्वधर्माचरणं शक्त्या विधर्माच्च निवर्तनम् ।
इन्द्रियाश्वविनिग्राहः सर्वथा न त्यजेत् त्रयम् ।।

श्रीवल्लभाचार्याः ।

PERFORMANCE OF ONE'S OWN RELIGIOUS DUTY (DHARMA) ACCORDING TO ONE'S CAPACITY, AVOIDANCE OF ANYTHING WHICH IS CONTRARY TO RELIGION, (POWERFUL) RESTRAINT IN ALL RESPECTS OF SENSE-HORSES—THESE THREE SHOULD NEVER BE GIVEN UP.

WITH THE COMPLIMENTS OF

The Scindia Steam Navigation Co., Ltd.
Scindia House, Ballard Estate, BOMBAY.

SECTION II

WORKS BY SHRI VALLABHACHARYA

"*Scholarship is rare, still rarer is the scholarship that enables one to comprehend the spirit of the Vedic lore. Even if it is possible, there is no consistency in the scholar's conduct with the precept. Granted that, even then, the scholar is not cognisant with the way of God-realisation. Let us admit that, such a scholar having the knowledge of God's love, is seen in the world, still his scholarship is conspicuous with the absence of the love for the Lord Krishna. Who else except Shri Vallabhacharya is endowed with all these qualities?*"

VITHALESHJI.

Anu-Bhashya: This is a commentary on the Brahma Sutras of Badarayana Vyas. Shamkara, Ramanuja, Shri Kantha, Bhaskara, Madhva, Nimbarka and others have written commentaries to interpret the philosophy of Badarayana from their own points of view. From his study of the Upanishads and the Brahma-Sutras, Vallabhacharya was convinced that full justice was not done by the above writers in interpreting the Brahmavada of the Upanishadas. He, therefore, wrote a commentary on the Brahma-Sutras to explain the Brahmavada of the Upanishadas.

Name of the Commentary: Originally it was not named as *Anu-Bhashya*. This title, it seems from lack of evidence, was unknown to Sri Vitthaleshaji-Vallabhacharya's son and his successor Purushottamaji who wrote a learned commentary named *Prakasha*, on it. Vitthalesha refers to it as *Tattva-Sutra-Bhashya* in connection with one of the names of Vallabha in the *Sarvottama Stotra*. It is referred to by that name for the first time by Giridharaji—the writer of *Vivarana*—commentary on the Anu-Bhashya. There is no trustworthy historical record available to throw light on this question. The title *Anu-Bhashya* is explained in three ways:

(1) '*Anu*' (small) is used for this commentary to distinguish it from another big commentary, supposed to have been written by Vallabha. A great deal of controversy raged the Scholars of Shuddhadvaita School about this. One school argues that Vallabha-

charya wrote only one commentary, while the other one (recently discovered) is from the pen of Purushottamaji. The other school of thought, favours the theory of two commentaries by Vallabha.

(2) '*Anu*' is indicative of the size of the soul, for, according to Vallabha, soul is small in size. This commentary dwells upon that particular feature of the Upanishadic philosophy which regards the soul as small and a part of Brahman. This is the peculiar trait of this commentary.

(3) There is the third explanation hazarded by late Shri H.O. Shastri. He thinks the word '*Anu*' conveys the sense of 'word'. As this commentary soley relies upon the word testimony of the Shruties, this name is so given to it.

Authorship: Although generally it is known to have been written by Vallabha, it is a half truth. From internal evidence, it is learnt that Vallabha wrote it up to the Sutra 3-2-34. Purushottamaji has also expressed that opinion in his *Prakasha* commentary on the Sutra 3-2-34. From that part onwards, the remaining portion is written by Sri Vitthaleshji, his worthy son.

Commentaries on the 'Anu-Bhashya': The following list gives some idea about the popularity of the Anu-Bhashya which is commented upon by the scholars of great genius and profound philosophical learning.

(1) *Prakasha* by Purushottamaji (2) *Rashmi* by Yogi Gopeshvara (3) *Vivarna* by Girdharaji (4) *Pradipa* by Iccharama Bhatt (5) *Gudhartha Dipika* by Lalu Bhatta (6) *Vyakhya* by Muralidhara. There have been attempts for abridgements also. They are *Bhava-Prakasika* by Krishnachandra and *Marichika* by Vrajanatha. Purushottamaji and Bhatta Narbherama have made independent efforts in their *Adhikarana-Malas* to bring out the meaning of each *Adhikarana*.

Shridhara Pathak has published a work, which contains the gist of all other commentaries. There are some more commentaries which have not been brought to light, namely, *Ananda Nidhi Mimansa* by Gokula Krishnabhatta, *Anu Bhashya Vivriti* by Vallabha, son of Sri Vitthaleshaji, *Anu-Bhashya Tika* by Ramanarayana, *Brahma Sutrartha Karikas* by Shri Devakinandana, *Brahma Sutra Vritti* by Shri Jivanesaji, *Anu Vritti*, *Anu Bhashya Sara*, *Adhikara Samkhya Vichara* by late Balakrishna Shastri and his son Kanthamani Shastri.

Anu-Bhashya is translated into Gujarati by Prof. J. G. Shah in two volumes. Late Prof. M. G. Shastri wrote an independent essay in English on *Shamkara's Refutation* of the Samkhyas in the Brahma Sutras, based upon *Anu Bhashya.* Late M. T. Telivala's essay 'How far Shamakracharya truly represents the author of B. S. and his learned introduction to some volumes of Rashmi will be of great help to the right study of *Anu Bhashya.*

Divisions of the chapters into the Padas, adhikaranas and the Sutras: The whole work of the Brahma Sutras is divided into 4 chapters, and each chapter into 4 *padas*. Each *pada* again is subdivided into unequal number of *adhikaranas* consisting of unequal number of the sutras. The following analysis will give the idea about the divisions and sub-divisions.

Chapter I

Padas	Adhikaranas	Sutras
1	10	30
2	8	32
3	13	43
4	8	28
	39	133

Chapter II

Padas	Adhikaranas	Sutras
1	12	37
2	8	45
3	16	53
4	10	22
	46	157

Chapter III

Padas	Adhikaranas	Sutras
1	8	27
2	11	41
3	25	66
4	9	51
	53	185

Chapter IV

1	6	19
2	7	21
3	5	17
4	5	22
	23	79

Subject-matter of Brahma Sutras: The first chapter is called *Samanvaya;* because its main object is to show that there is harmony among the various descriptions of Brahman known under different names in the Upanishadas. It describes *Brahman* and none else. The second chapter is called *Virodhadhyaya.* It is devoted to the refutation of the views of other schools. The third chapter is called *Sadhanadhyaya* because it describes the various means and evaluates them for God-realisation. The last one *Faladhyaya* deals with the topic of the final goal (*fala*) of souls seeking *Brahman* by a path of knowledge and a path of devotion.

Method of treatment

Discussion of each new point, arising out of main problem begins in a separate *Adhikarana,* which has five parts: (1) *Vishaya*-matter to be determined, (2) *Vishesha* objector's point of view (3) *Purvapaksha* presentation of matter from the objector's point of view; (4) *Uttarapaksha* presentation of the case by the author from his point of view; (5) *Sangati* i.e. consistency in and support to the author's view from the texts of the Upanishads and other pertinent scriptures.

Contents:

Chapter I. It has four *padas,* each of them is known as (1) Karya Pada (2) Antaryami Pada (3) Upasya Pada and (4) miscellaneous respectively. The second and the third padas are known as Adheya pada and Adhara Pada also.

The first pada opens with the declaration of the writer's aim in this work—investigation into the nature of Brahman. It is followed by three adhikaranas with statements that Brahman is the material and the efficient cause of the world and the souls.

The world is the manifestation of the (*Sat*). Existence part and the souls, of the (*Chit*) consciousness part of Brahman. Then, in the fifth *adhikaran* (1-5-11/18), Brahman's *Ananda* (Bliss) aspect is emphasised on the authority of T.U., where it is also designated as *Rasa*. This is also described as *Anandamaya.* Some interpreters take the meaning of *Anandmaya* in the sense of composed of *Ananda* but Vallabha takes it in the sense of full of *Ananda. Anandamaya* is a synonymn of *Ananda.* In these 2 to 5 Adhikaranas, Vallabha, with the author of the Brahma Sutras, asserts that Brahman, taught by the Upanishads, is (*Sat-Chit-Ananda*) Being, Consciousness and Bliss. In the subsequent portion of this *pada*, he maintains that in some Upanishads, although some other words are used instead of *Brahman*, they are significant of *Brahman*. These include *Aditya*, (Sun) *Akash* (Sky), *Prana* (Vital breath), *Jyoti* (Light), *Bkuman, Akashara Dham*, etc. These should be understood in the Upanishads in the sense of Brahman.

Pada 2: It is intended for the removal of doubts arising from the passages of the Upanishads. Some adjectival words indicate their application to the soul, some to the world and some to both. But in this part, it is stated that even they describe *Brahman* and not the soul or the world or both. This part describes *Brahman* as *Adheya* (supportable). Brahman is represented as *Manomaya, Hiranamaya*, Enjoyer, as a *Purusha* in the eye, In-dweller, controlller, Vaishvanara etc. The qualities or powers which are supposed as belonging to the souls, do in reality belong to God. They are expressive of *Brahman's* qualities.

Pada 3: It is known as *Adhara.* It deals with *Brahman* as support. It discusses the question whether the low caste persons are eligible for the knowledge of *Brahman.* The Shrutis are not inclined to admit the low caste people to the knowledge of *Brahman.* Janashruti, no doubt was admitted to it by Raikya, not because he was a low caste man by birth, but because he proved his eligibility by his virtue. He was addressed as Shudra because his heart was moved to tears in his earnest desire to know *Brahman.*

Pada 4: It examines the claim of the Samkhya to establish its formula that the principles of that school are derived from the Upanishads. Their misconceptions are removed and their theory of the causality of *Prakriti* is rendered ineffectual. The

Upanishads teach only Brahman as the cause and not *Prakriti* (matter) as supposed by the Samkhyas. *Prakriti* and *Purushas* are not ultimate principles. They are derivatives of Brahman. Sometimes *Prakriti* is said to be a material cause, but in those cases the word *Prakriti* is used for Brahman.

Chapter II: The object of this chapter is to refute the theories of the rival schools, namely, the Samkhya, the Yoga, the Nyaya, the Vaishashika, the Pancha Ratras, Buddhism and Jainism, and to establish Brahmvada.

Pada 1: For the refutation of the causality of *Prakriti* by the Samkhya the following arguments are advanced.

(1) *Prakriti* is unconscious. It, therefore, cannot create the world and urge souls into activity.

(2) Without the conscious principle, the unconscious matter cannot be moved.

(3) If the *Prakriti's* power of evolving the world out of itself unaided by any other agency is admitted, there will be no end of the world. But the world has an origin and also an end.

(4) The Samkhyas argue that just as grass eaten by the cows turns into milk, so does *Prakriti* evolve the world out of it. But this argument does not cut ice. In the case of the cow eating grass, the cow is conscious, though grass is unconscious. If grass is not eaten by the cow, the grass itself will not be turned into milk. In the same way, without the conscious principle, the unconscious *Prakriti* is unable to evolve the world.

(5) It is not true to say that *Prakriti* reveals activity for the enjoyment of the soul. This is against the nature of *Prakriti.*

(6) Nor can it be maintained that *Prakriti* acts under the influence of *Purusha.* It is like a lame and a blind man, helping each other to reach the destination in their journey. Again, in this supposition one must be the chief one to lead and the other to be led. One cannot say that it is Purusha. In that case, it is lending support to the Brahmavada. Nor can one say Prakriti is the chief as it has no consciousness (2-1-1 to 2-2-10).

Refutation of the Atomic theory of the Vaishashikas:

The Vaishesikas consider atoms as the material cause of the world. The Nyaya school also accepts this view. They accept God only as an efficient cause. He is just like a Supra-soul. They think the atoms first combine into *Dvyanuka*; then the latter into *Tryanuka* etc. This theory is rejected on the basis of the following reassons:

1. The atoms have no space according to the Vaishesikas. Their combination into atoms is impossible.
2. The Vaisheshikas believe atoms to be eternal. If this is accepted, then, there will be no dissolution of the world.
3. The supposition, that they have forms, is wrong. If it is so, then they will be ephemeral.
4. It is not accepted by the *Vaidikas*.

Incidentally their *Asat Karyavada* which holds that the effect has no existence, is also refuted. No doubt in some passages of the Upanishadas, the word *Asat* is used: "It was *Asat* before." Here the word *Asat* does not mean Non-existent, but means non-manifest. Before creation Brahman was non-manifest and the world and the souls were not revealed. This does not deny the existence of the world and the souls, prior to their manifestation. They were unrevealed like a folded piece of cloth. When it is unfolded, one knows what it exactly is and its extent, weight and colour etc. *Asat* means unfoldment and not non-existence. The criticism which was levelled against the Samkhya school is applicable to the Vaisheshikas. The Samkhyas hold Prakriti as a material cause and the Vaisheshikas hold atoms, as that, but both *Prakriti* and the atoms being unconscious themselves cannot be the material cause. The argument of the Vaisheshikas, that God is the efficient cause that imparts motion to the atoms for combination, is vitiated by the above reasons.

Refutation of the Buddhistic School:

The Baudhas reject God. One school accepts ultimate consciousness. It holds the world as unreal and due to ignorance. The author rejects it summarily. He attacks their theories of momentariness and of production of things in the succeeding moment.

1. The Buddhistic theory of non-existence of the world cannot be supported by the Vedic authorities.
2. If the world has no existence, how is it that it comes into our experience? We all experience the world and therefore it must have existence.

3. It cannot be argued that it is unreal like a dream. It is wrong to compare the external objects with dream phenomena. The dream experience is not real, since it is contradicted in the waking state. The experience of the external objects is not gainsaid. It does not change every moment. It leaves its impression in the memory, which when revoked, reveals the experience of the objects in the past.
4. To say that the desires are at the root of worldly misery is wrong. If external objects have no existence, the desires also will not have existence. How can the thing which has no existence become the cause of worldly bondage? (2-2-28 to 2-2-31)

Refutation of the Syadavada of the Jainas:

They hold that all things are relatively real. Their theory is known as *Syadvada.* It is expressed through the doctrine of *Saptabhangi Nyaya,* which expresses the relativity in seven ways positively and negatively. It says, our positive as well as negative experience must be accepted as relatively real. It is opposed to logic to the law of contraries. One thing cannot be at the same time existing and non-existing. Concepts of 'to be and not to be' are opposed to each other. This school believes that the size of the soul varies according to its body. If this is accepted all the souls will be unequal. It believes in the expansion and contraction of the soul, which cannot be accepted. In that case the souls will be subject to modification (2-2-33 to 2-2-36).

The tenets of the *Panchratra* system are rejected in the Sutras: 2-2-42 to 2-2-44.

Pada 3: It attempts to explain the order in which five elements were created. (2-3-1 to 2-3-14) It then, considers production of Vijnana and Manas. T.U. mentions that order as: *Annamaya, Manomaya, Pranamaya, Vijnanamaya* and *Anandamaya.* Shamkara understands these as sheaths (*Koshas or Upadhis*), but Vallabha takes them as *Vibhutis* of Brahman, who is *Rasa* (Love) or *Ananda* (Bliss) (2-3-15 to 2-3-16). This part describes the nature and form of souls. Souls are many. They are real. They represent consciousness (*Chit*) aspect of Brahman. They are not productions but emanaion from God, like sparks from fire. They are *amshas* (parts) of God and the relation between them and God is that of a part and the whole. They are not knowledge but knowers (2-3-18). They are atomic and not pervasive (2-3-19 to 2-3-22). Though located in the heart, the soul pervades the whole body like sandal paste applied to one part of the body (2-3-23 to 2-3-28). Souls are doers and not non-doers, as believed by the Samkhya. If souls have not to perform work, why should the Vedas prescribe it as obligatory for all. They are also enjoyers of the fruits of actions (2-3-41). In 2-3-41, it is stated that the doership of the soul really belongs to Brahman and it is transferred to it. In fact, activity of work ultimately belongs to God. It is God who urges souls to do work.

In Padas 1, 2 and 3 the following principles have been propounded: Non-difference of the effect from the cause (II-1-14 to 20), Brahman's integrity is not affected by the world (II-1-26 to 29). The manifold powers of Brahman are stated (II-1-30-31). The world is God's *lila* (II-1-32-33). The order of the creation and absorption of elemental substances is not affected by the creation and absorption of sense organs, mind etc., for, creation and absorption are nothing but God's powers of manifestation and non-manifestation. Birth and death are spoken as of the body only and figuratively of the soul because of its connection with the body. Soul has neither birth nor death (II-3-16 to 17). The soul's dependence on God (II-3-41 to 43) and its relation to Brahman as a part to the whole (II-3-43 to 53) is proved.

Pad 4: It considers the origin and the number of the organs. The organs are seven in number and they are minute in size (II-4-1 to 6). It asserts (II-4-8) that the chief vital breath owes its origin to Brahman. In II-4-9 to 12, it is differentiated from air and the sense-functions. These organs are independent principles and not modifications of the chief breath (II-4-17-19). After the three elements are fashioned by God, the names and forms are given to them by God (II-4-20 to 22).

Chapter III

It is known as *Sadhana-Adhyaya*, dealing with the means of reaching Brahman. The portion dealing with means forms the 4th Pada. Before it is considered, it is necessary once more to have knowledge about the nature of Supreme God which occurs in Pada II.

Pada 1: The following chief points are emphasised here:- The soul's passing out of the body at the time of death, enveloped by subtle material elements (III-1-1 to 7) and clinging to the soul, before re-birth, of residual *karma* determining the nature of the new birth (III-1-8 to 11) are referred to. Some souls after death go to the lunar world and some do not go there. The evil doers go to the world of *Yama* or to the hells. To get a new body, five oblations must be completed, but this rule is not universal. At any rate, the evil doers do not go to the moon-world. The soul on its return from the moon and descending to the world for a new birth resides in succession, in heaven rain, earth, a male, and a female. In the rain it assumes the form of a shower, in the earth of food, in a male of virility and in the woman of the foetal womb (III-1-22 to 27). Through its connection with a male, the soul enters the woman and acquires a new body fit for experiencing the results of past residual *karma.*

Pada 2: The chief problems of this section are dream phenomena and the nature of Supreme Reality.

The question first considered is whether dream experiences are real. The reply is that they are not real. They belong to Illusion. They are only partially true experiences of the wakeful condition. Some dreams are indicative of good or bad results. The human soul, though a part of God, forgets its divinity because of the discretion in it of the qualities of God, namely potentiality, virility, glory, beauty, knowledge and non-attachment. It is this obscuration of the divine qualities due to God's power that has become the cause of its bondage. In order to be free from this bondage, the soul should know the real nature of God.

Nature of God is stated in the Sutras III-2-11 to 21. The Upanishads assert oneness of God. Although, as *Nirakara* and *Sakara,* God is one and these two are the two ways of describing God, the *Sakara* way is positive way of asserting God's form as Divine and the *Nirakara* way is the negative way of asserting absence of worldy form in God. It denies the worldly qualities but asserts its divine qualities. If this meaning is not intended, how can two accounts of opposite character apply to Brahman? There are not two Brahmans-one principal (*Nirakara*) and another subsidiary (*Sakara*). God is not formless. He has a form but it is divine. One cannot define God by the worldy ways. He is indescribable, unthinkable and beyond the power of human speech. Just as the light of the sun is revealed in its rays so God's form is revealed in various forms of the universe. It is manifest as well as non-manifest like the coil of a serpent in a straight and a circular form. In the same way God in the *Sakara* (manifest) as well as in the *Nirakara* (non-manifest) form is the same. He is the Supreme Reality with its dual aspect. He is the ultimte goal. The reward of our actions is to be got from God. So all our means of realisation must be directed towards God.

Pada 3: The main problem here is that God has been described differently in different works, so in what way one should adore God or on what particular aspect the mind must be concentrated. It is said that one has to choose one aspect of God. The different accounts are due to different kinds of experience of the worshipper. These different forms of God known or experienced by worshippers do not imply that Gods are many. In all such experiences, there is only one God. Difference is due to temperament and fitness of the worshippers. Those who are temperamentally fit for action (sacrifice), realise God through God's form of sacrifice; those who are qualified for the path of knowledge, realise God through *Akshara.* In the Puranas, we find different accounts of God's incarnations. A man may choose any incarnation which suits his temperament and realise God. Similarly, there are different accounts of God's *lilas* and aspects, such as loving God, wonderful God, terrific God, etc. A devotee may choose any one of the forms for realisation of God, but once chosen must stick to it. God reveals Himself to the soul in the form it remembers or adores Him. The devotee should fix his mind on Love or Bliss aspect of God. A soul approaching God through devotion has no fear from sins. The fruit of devotion is the attainment of Purushottam and that of knowledge is Moksha through *Akshara.* Devotion is of two kinds: the *Maryada* (dependent upon the scriptures and limited to nine-fold subdivision) and the Pushti which is pure love. Devotion of the type of love is the supreme means. It is superior to social love, patriotism and even morality. The laws of *karma* do not apply to a devotee, nor is it incumbent on him to seek knowledge. Through love, he should acquire *sarvatmabhava,* beholding or experiencing God in all conditions of life.

As for meditation, the meditator should select any form of God and concentrate on it. The devotee experiences God by love alone. The form of God who is the object of the devotee's love is Krishna who is perfect Love and Bliss.

Pada 4: This section discusses the relative importance of action, knowledge and devotion. First of all, Jaimini's view about the superiority of action over knowledge is stated. The following arguments are used by him:

Jaimini's theory of work (3-4-3)

1. Men like Vasishtha, Janak and others, who valued knowledge had performed sacrificial ceremonies.
2. Apastamba Sutra (3-1-1) lays down that a man who has acquired knowledge of Brahman is entitled to perform work.
3. The scriptures strictly prescribe that the *Agnihotra* sacrifices must be performed as long as there is life.

Badarayana's view: (3-4-8 to 25):

1. Superiority of knowledge to action is declared in Brihadaranyaka (4-4-22).
2. Both knowledge and work are emphasised. Just as Janaka resorted to work although he was a *Jnani*, so Shuka renounced work. Examples of both kinds are found in the Upanishads. This means that both have equal value.
3. Action is important but not for Moksha.
4. The recluses are exempted from sacrificial ceremonies.

Badarayana concludes that both are necessary but these disciplines should be subordinated to devotion. The sacrifices have their utility like the service of a horse in reaching destination, but when the destination is reached, the horse is of no use. In the same way, the sacrifices are helpful to acquire devotion by purifying the mind.

From 3-4-35 onwords, the topic of devotion as a means to realisation is considered in relation to action and knowledge, leading to the proposition of superiority of devotion to action and knowledge. Here it is stated that even the *Dharmas* relating to Ashramas should be discarded in favour of devotion.

The fruit of knowledge is Moksha, but that of devotion is enjoyment of God's love. The devotee seeks only God's love and grace by his love for Him.

Chapter IV:

This is called *Faladhyaya* as it deals with the fruit of knowledge and devotion. The fruit of knowledge is *Moksha*, merging of the soul into Brahman, but that of devotion is enjoyment of God's love in the state of union with Him as a separate entity. Here the two kinds of devotion are indicated. One of them is called *Maryada Bhakti*, also known as *Vaidhi* or *Vihita*, and the other called *Pushti*, dependent only upon God's grace. It is also called *Ragatmika* devotion. The *Pushti* devotee does not crush down his desires, but so trains and sublimates them that through them, he wants to enjoy God's love. To him God is all the *Purusharthas* of life. God is his Dharma, Wealth, Kama (happiness) and Moksha. In this kind of love, the devotee forgets his worldly associations. He is indifferent to the Vedic asceticism or the Yogic discipline. He lives only for God. He wishes to possess God by his own love and God's grace.

Pada 1: Regarding *Maryada Bhakti*, its repetition is emphasised till the fruit is reached (4-1-12). Power of knowledge, rendering sins ineffective, is referred to in 4-1-13 and 14, but the fruits of *Prarabdha Karmas* must be enjoyed. But the Pushti devotees are exempted from this. Their *karmas* are annihilated without enjoyment. The Pushti devotee acquires a divine body (*Tanunavatva*) and enjoys bliss in God's company.

Padas 2 and 3: Development of *Pushti Bhakti* and experience of the *Pushti* devotee is the main topic here. During this experience, the speech, the senses, the mind and vital breath are centred in God exclusively. Similarly experience of the *Maryada Bhakti* is described. The nature of *Pushti Bhakti* is very subtle and indescribable. It can be experienced but cannot be expressed.

Some space here is devoted to the discussion of a *Gnani*, after departure from life, by the path of light, till he reaches *Brahma Loka*.

In IV-3-15-16, the use of symbol for God is discussed and it is emphasised that it should be discarded.

Pada 4: It says that even the souls who have attained Brahman are brought out again, so that they may participate in the bliss of God. The soul gets the new body fit for enjoyment of God's love. Jaimini is of opinion that the enjoyment of the soul is with Brahman who is Being, Consicousness and Bliss and Audolmy thinks that it is with Brahamn who is consciousness only but Badarayan believes that the enjoyment of the soul is with love or Bliss form of God, enveloped by divine body. This enjoyment is not due to the soul's power but due to God's possession of the soul. Just as a lamp gives light to the oil drenched wick, so does God make the soul fit for enjoyment. In this state the soul acquires likeness with God except the power of creation. Finally it is stated that neither the *Gnanis* nor the devotees come back to this world, after they have reached their respective goals which is *Moksha* in the case of the *Gnanis* and the enjoyment of God's love in the case of the *Pushti Bhakta.*

Tattva Dipa Nibandha: This is an independent work of Vallabhacharya having three parts—Part 1 known as *Shastrartha*, Part II as *Sarva Nirnaya* and Part III as *Bhagvatartha Prakarana.* The first part is intended to expound philosophy of the Gita, the second to discuss and explain relative importance of the various Religious schools among the Hindus and emphasise the importance of Devotion as a means to God—Realisation. The third part analyses the ideas of each book group, divisions of chapters and of individual chapters. These three works taken together form one compendium.

The work is written in the Karika form and it is explained by a commentary-Prakasha written by Vallabhacharya himself.

Tattva Dipa Nibandha: Part I. It has in all 104 Karikas. It deals with the problems considered in the Gita. It is called *Shastrartha.* The meaning of the Shastra, here, is the Gita.

Commentaries available

1. Avarana Bhanga by Purushottamji.
2. Yojana by Lalu Bhatta.
3. Sat Sneha Bhajan by Pandit Gattulala. (Incomplete).
4. Tippani.

Contents: In the beginning having offered salutation to Lord Krishna, the author tells us that the work is meant for the devotees of *Sattvika* class whose hearts and minds are pure and whose goal is Salvation. For devotional life, knowledge about God from the scriptures is necessary. As the Gita contains the essence of all the scriptures, and is very popular, he selects that work and attempts to expound it. (1-4)

God is known variously as *Brahman* in the Upanishadas, as *Parmatman* in the *Smrities.*

For the knowledge of God, the world and the souls, the only authority is the scriptures which according to Vallabhacharya, are the Vedas, the Gita, the Brahmasutras and the Bhagavata. Other Shastras such as Jaiminis Purva Mimansa, and the Smriti works, other Puranas and the epics are also authoritative if they are in consonance with the first four. The Proofs of knowledge are not to be trusted. The reasons for that are given in Chapter II. Only the scriptures are free from uncertainty. Among the four scriptures mentioned above the Gita is valuable, the B.S. more than the Gita, and the Bhagavata is the most valuable. Each succeeding testimony is meant to remove doubts arising from each preceding testimony. These four scriptures taken collectively are called *Prasthan Chatusthayi.* (6 to 10).

The entire Veda consists of two parts (1) the Purvakanda comprising the Samhita and the Brahmanas, and (2) the Uttara Kanda—comprising of the Aranyakas and the Upanishadas. The first describes God as sacrifice, God's power of action and the second as Brahman, and in the Bhagavata as Lord Krishna. In other Puranas God is described under various names.

For Moksha *Sattvika* knowledge should be acquired but for union with God devotion to Lord Krishna should be offered. (11 to 16).

Marks of Knowledge, action and Devotion:

Realising God in all the forms is true knowledge. Placidity of mind, mark of true action and being in the Grace of God is the mark of true devotion. The scriptures mention the above three means but an aspirant of religious life adopts means for which he is temperamentally fit.

All these means are good in their own ways, but in this Kali Age no other means except Devotion is reliable for God-realisation.

Those who have studied the scriptures with an unbiassed mind respect devotion alone but those who are intoxicated by pride of learning do not resort to it. (S)..22.

Nature of the World:

In the first place one must know the nature of the world which is through ignorance mistaken for Samsara, the state of worldly bondage. There are various theories on the nature of the world. The Samkhyas think Prakriti as the material cause of the world, the Vaisheshikas the atoms, materialists think it self-existent. To Bauddhas it is due to ignorance. All these views are erroneous and hostile to the Vedas. Even Shamkara has erred in making Maya conditioned Ishvara as a material cause, and not Brahman who is an ultimate Reality. He considers the world as unreal. Vallabha says the world is God's work and hence real. It should be differentiated from Samsara which is due to the ignorance of the soul. The withdrawal of the world depends upon God's own will and the removal of the Samsara on the efforts of the soul by knowledge and devotion. (2-3-24)

The world is created by God using Maya—His own power as an instrument.

Nature of Brahman:

Brahman is the supreme Reality or God. It is all pervasive. It is *Sakara*, having its form Divine. It is immanent and at the same time transcendental. It has infinite forms. Though appearing as divided into various forms, it is indivisible. The world and the souls are emanations from the Being and Consciousness-aspects of Brahman. The world represents only Being without consciousness and Bliss, the souls, Being and consciousness without bliss. Akshara has being, consciousness and bliss but the last only in a limited measure. Purushottama or Supreme God is perfect Bliss. As Bliss has been not manifested in the world and the souls they are formless.

Vidya and Avidya (Knowledge and Ignorance):

These two are the powers of God due to Maya and they operate upon the souls by the will of God. Under their impact the soul experiences happiness or misery.

Avidya has five forms by which it influences the soul and leads it away from the path of devotion. They are-mistaking body and the organs, the vital breath and internal organ for the soul, and forgetfulness of the real nature of the soul, that it is the Amsha of God. Result of the operation of Avidya is worldly-bondage for the soul. Avidya keeps the soul away from God, but through Vidya, it can unite with God. It reminds the soul of its relation with God and the means it should adopt for union with God. It makes the soul liberated in its life time (*Jivanmukta*). The superimpositions of the soul on body, organs and vital breath are removed. The body, the organs and the vital breath do function, but they are not mistaken for those of the soul.

Besides the knowledge-way indicated above, the superimposition can be removed by the divine nature of the organs through service of God or *Asanya.*

Acquiring essence of Brahman or God-state, known as *Sayujya* is to be had only through the service of God (31-35).

Creation:

There are six kinds of creations mentioned in Chapter II. (1) by God Himself (2) by Purusha (3) by Vasudev (4) for Pushti souls (5) by Illusion (6) by evolution.

Definition of Devotion

Devotion is most inviolable and supreme love for God, preceded by knowledge of God's greatness. Moksha is to be got only by this. (42)

Description of God:

God is one with having many forms. He is devoid of all fruits, and is possessed of endless flawless qualities in perfection. He is self-dependent, destitute of the qualities of unconscious body and All Bliss. His body is Divine and full of Bliss. He is free from three kinds of differences. (1) inherent in oneself as different parts, hands feet etc. in the body, belonging to the same class, (2) as one tree to the trees of its class and (3) those differentiating from others, as one tree from another or another kind. In all forms Brahman is one (43-44).

Moksha is got only by grace of God. Some times it is got by pilgrimage to a holy place, but even there grace of God is the only cause. Hence for Moksha it is necessary to resort to God and be devoted to Him leaving aside all other means (47-49).

Moksha means the God-state of Bliss during realisation of God. In that state the soul becomes conscious only of the bliss of God, forgetting its association with the body, the organs etc. The body and the organs do remain with their worldly nature. It is not necessary to renounce the world for liberation. One can get it even as a house-holder through devotion.

The Bhagavata describes various ways of God realisation through devotion. One wishing to realise God should have trust in the Bhagavata. For this the intellect must be purified by the study of the Bhagavata, disregarding all other means except devotion.

Nature of the Soul:

The soul is infinitesincally small. Its chief attribute is consciousness. It pervades the whole body though located in the heart like scent of sandal paste, applied only to a small part of the body. It is not pervasive. However when in the state of Brahmanand in union with God, it acquires likeness with God, it is said to be pervasive, but it is not so because it is not the nature of soul, but because of God's association and possession of it. By itself it is small, less than one hundredth part of the end of hair. The soul's light of consciousess cannot be known by the organs. It can be known only by the mind controlled by Yoga-practice during meditation, by knowledge or by favour of God.

Some times, it is described as a reflection or as phenomenal appearance of God. This is because God's joy-form is not manifested in the soul-state. In reality it is neither a reflection nor an appearance, but as real as God.

Those who assert that the soul is a reflection of God into Maya (Illusion) or Avidya (Nescience) are leading men astray from the path of devotion. Their theory has no support from the scriptures, nor can it be proved logically. If the soul is a reflection of formless Brahman as believed by the Mayavadins how can there be a reflection of a formless object into the mirror? If Maya is mirror then it being impure, how can it reflect an object? The Mayavadins believe that Brahman and Maya are both beginningless and pervasive. If they are both beginningless then one must reject the theory of absolute nondualism of Brahman as there are two principles at the back of creative activity. If both are pervasive how can there be any reflection and whose reflection in whom? There must be some space between the two. Sponsors of Maya theory consider Maya as a veil covering Brahman. If so, how can it produce reflection. Thus the Maya theory is untenable. Similarly the phenomenality of the soul cannot be accepted. It is as real as God. It is an *Amsha* of God. The soul is able to realise God only through devotion. Penance, knowledge etc. have been mentioned as means, but they do not teach the real truth about realisation of God (53-64).

Brahman:

Brahman's form consists of Being, consciousness and joy. It is omnipotent, omnipresent and omniscient. It is independent and eternal and destitute of worldly qualities. It is the support of all beings and controller of Maya. Its form is joy.

God is the Lord of Prakriti (matter) and Purushas (soul). It is every where and in all relations. Though immanent in the world, it is transcendental. No theory can comprehend Him. Nothing can describe Him. It has multifareous forms. He reveals Himself into endless forms, each of which expresses His particular quality or power. He is a substratum of opposite qualities. Though it is static yet dynamic. He cannot be known by any of the worldly ways. He possesses two powers (1) Avirbhava by which He manifests the world and the souls and (2) Tirobhava by which He draws them back into Him. He is to be realised by the devotees by His Grace or Will. (65-75)

He is not open to the charge of partiality and ruthlessness since, He himself is the creator of the differences in the situations and conditions in the world, for His own pleasure. He has fixed the rules for the conduct of the souls and the fruits of their actions. Considered all actions by souls as due to the Will of God, the question of partiality or ruthlessness does not arise or considered as actions of the souls, God is not responsible for their happiness or misery because God has given these souls a code of conduct by which they have to abide. If they violate it, they must suffer the consequences. Either way the responsibility in the matter of the happiness or misery of the souls does not lie upon God. (76-77)

The world and its cause:

The Mayavadins suppose the Maya-conditioned Brahman as the cause of the world and the world is unreal. But this is wrong. The Maya theory has no support in the scriptures. The word Maya is absent in the Upanishadas except in Shvetashvatara, where it is used in the sense of the Power of God. In the Puranas no doubt Maya in the sense of illusion is mentioned but it is for the reason to make persons shun worldly attachments, and be devoted to God. No body can say that the world is unreal, since it can be seen by one's own eyes. If it is argued that unreality of the world is indicated in the *Vacharambhana Vakya* of the Upanishad, it should be noted that the context does not convey the sense of unreality, but only of non-difference between the world and Brahman. Their differences are due to speech. The Shrutis declaring Brahman as a creator, should not be considered as exception. The Shrutis do not recognise two Gods. There is only one God who is a creator of the world also. God being one, His personal and Impersonal forms are equally real. It is incorrect to say that the impersonal Brahman is real, and the Personal unreal, as supposed by the Mayavadins. But personality and impersonality both belong to Him, to one God, only viewed differently. The Gita in XVI-8 denounces persons believing the world, to be unreal as demons. (78-90). The world is not unreal but the intellect which it cognises as unreal is false. The view of the Samkhya, rejecting Brahman and accepting Prakriti as a material cause, is not correct. The Yoga school admits God only for the purpose of meditation, and so stands on a weak ground. Its non-acceptance of God as a material cause of the world is opposed to the scriptures (91-94).

For Moksha or Asceticism: Knowledge, penance, mental control and love, either collectively or separately are good as means. But love expressed through the service of God is the best means. Love alone or love with knowledge is conducive to Moksha. All other means are inferior. This is the meaning not only of the Gita but of all the scriptures including the Vedas, Ramayana, Mahabharata, Pancharatra, Brahma Sutras and others (94-104).

Tattvartha Dipa Nibandha (Part II) Sarva Nirnaya:

Praman Section

In the first part, he deals with the *Gita* philosophy. It consists of 329 Karikas with the undermentioned commentaries.

(1) Prakasha by Vallabhacharya (2) Avarana Bhanga by

Purushottamaji, (3) Satsnehabhajan by Gattulala (4) Yojana by Lalu Bhatta and (5) Tippani.

It is divided into four parts (1) *Pramana* (authority) (2) *Prameya* (knowable) (3) *Sadhana* (means) (4) *Fala* (fruit or goal).

The Vedas consist of two parts (1) The Samhita and the Brahmanas and (2) The Aranyaks and the Upanishadas. The first part deals with sacrifice or action aspect of God and the second with knowledge aspect of God. Action and knowledge are the two powers or forms of God. Action and knowledge are not antagonists to, but complementary to each other as aids to each other. Sacrifice needs knowledge and knowledge needs sacrifice. Samkar rejects the sacrifice and accepts only knowledge part of the Vedas. Jaimini accepts only the sacrifice, Ramanuja accepts both, Vallabha also accepts them both and reconciles them as to how they should be used as aids to devotion for the service of God.

Sacrifice: Sacrifice is the form of God. There are five kinds of sacrifices-the *Agnihotra*, the *Darsa-purnamasa*, the *Pasu*, the *Chaturmasyas* and the *Soma* out of which the first four are to be performed daily, monthly, six monthly and annually respectively, and the last one independently. These have also two other divisions called *Prakriti* or *Nitya* and *Vikriti* or *Kamya*. These sacrifices must be performed strictly in accordance with the injunctions of the Vedas.

Not only the sacrifices, but also their accessories constitute the form of God. Their fruit is temporary heavenly happiness in its lower sense, and spiritual happiness in its higher sense. Heavenly happiness lasts till the stock of merits is exhausted. Spiritual happiness is the result of the development or perfection of Sattva Guna. All men seek happiness. Some religious minded men seek heavenly happiness but it is not pure and eternal. It is mixed with pain. Moksha alone is free from pain. So it should be preferred.

There are three kinds of souls—Godly, human and demonical. They interpret the Vedas and make use of the Vedic teaching in their own ways.

Those who desire heavenly happiness should perform sacrifices strictly in accordance with Vedic rules, but they should know that after their stock of merits is exhausted, they come back to the world. If they do not desire rebirth then they should betake to knowledge.

Even the materials used in a sacrifice manifest God's form. The sacrifices however should be performed for liberation or spiritual happiness (1-32).

Smritis: They are the works of the sages of latter times. They are the attempts to conserve Vedic knowledge preserved in the memory of the sages. Their value is inferior. They have protective value and can be compared with houses that afford protection to their dwellers against heat, cold and the rains. The Smritis protect us against all evils. They dwell upon Dharma and explain its nature and utility. They give Dharma a local colour and so there are many Smirtis—differing sometimes from each other on important matters. Each Smriti is to be understood, with reference to a particular place and the circumstances. Their truths are not eternal.

Dharma according to the Smritis is of five fold nature, consisting of performance of the ceremonies connected with 16 *Samsakaras*. viz.*Sandhya*, *Shraddha*, *Paka*, *Yajna* (*Deva Yajna*), *Rajsi Yajna*, *Pitri Yajna*, *Manusya Yajna* and *Bhuta Yajna* i.e. sacrifice to Gods, Sages, ancestors, men, and other beings and *Prayaschita* (Repentance for the offences committed).

The Kalpa Sutras which are though compositions of the sages should be regarded as of mixed character of Vedas and the Smritis. The *Grihya* Karmas, however, should be included in the Smritis.

They are compared with the furniture kept in the house for physical and mental comforts. If the Smritis give protection against hostile external forces of Time, the Puranas give true happiness and peace to the soul.

The Puranas:

The accounts in these Puranas differ but it is because, they are intended for men of particular temperaments. The teaching of the Puranas is of universal nature. The Vedas are meant only for the intelligent class, and only for male members who belong to the higher strata of society, the Mahabharata is intended for women and persons of low class, but the Puranas are meant for all types of men and women.

Of all the Puranas the Bhagavata is of the highest spiritual value. Its aim is not only Moksha but also God-realisation through devotion. It was composed by Vyasa, after his compilation of the Mahabharata and the Brahma Sutras, which having failed in giving him internal peace, he had an urge from God in response of which he oompiled it. He felt that, in the Kali Age, men's minds were prone to neglect religion due to impurities of time, place, the materials, holy formula, initiators of the religious rites and persons entrusted with their performance. It is not the age for ritualistic performance of the Vedas, nor favourable for knowledge and asceticism. He found devotional life as proper for men and women of Kali Age. The relation between the Vedas and the Smritis is that of the object and its reflection in the mirror. Generally the mirror reflects the object as it is, yet, there is a difference between the object and its reflection. Our purpose is served by the object and not by a reflection. The Smritis cannot be good guides in all the cases. Their teachings have no permanent value. They fluctuate from time to time, according to local requirements.

They are 18 in number divided principally into three groups —each group consisting of 6 Puranas, designated according to three Deities—Brahma (Creator) Vishnu (Preserver) and Shiva (Destroyer of the world) or according to three gunas of nature—*Sattva* (goodness, knowledge, peace etc.) *Rajas* (Action, Restlessness etc.) and *Tamas* (Inertia). The first group is intended for introvert types, the second for extrovert and the third for the idiotics. The aim of the Puranas is to put the knowledge of the Vedas within reach of men and women of all types and all classes in a simplified and poetical form.

If the Shritis and Smritis are the eyes of Dharma, the Puranas constitute the heart. So to teach people faith in God and belief in devotion, he composed the Bhagavata. It was the Dharma not of the brain, but of the heart. It did not need supreme intellect but purest heart and love for God. (33-71)

Six Vedangas:

Shiksha dealing with Science of Pronunciation *Kalpa* on rituals, *Nirukta* on etymology and the meanings of the Vedas, *Chhandas* on prosody, *Vyakarana,* on grammar and *Jyotish* on Astrology—these six independent works on the Vedas are known as the Auxi liaries or the *Angas*. They are written in aphoristic style. Each one of them deals with a particular aspect of the Vedas, the aim being to clarify and systematise the Vedic learning. By these works the form and spirit of the Vedic learning are preserved, for the guidance of the students of the Vedas in future. Besides the above works there are four works known as Upavedas namely—The *Ayurvedas* (Science of life) *Dhanush Veda* (Science of Missiles), *Gandharva Veda* (Science of Music), *Sthapatya Veda* (Science of Architecture). Each one of these has practical utility in the society. Similarly works known as *Dharma Shastras*, (Sciences of Dharma) *Artha Shastra* (Science of Wealth) *Kama Shastra* (Science of happiness) and *Moksa Shastras* (Sciences relating to Moksa) which are the works of the sages of later times, have also their use in the interests of the society and also of the individuals which will create the ideal society with men equipped with high intelligence, robust and healthy bodies, loving nature and ultmistic motives, and specifically inclined to devotional life—whose goal is God-realisation. The works of the Samkhya Yoga, Nyaya and Vaisheshika systems and of others, which lead men astray from God, should be avoided. Even poetical compositions which may be beautiful in their style and language, must be avoided as poison, if they have baleful influence on the soul. They are like rotten souls in fine bodies. They urge men to seek worldly pleasures and turn away from God. Of course the works like the Mahabharata and Ramayana are exceptions. In short all works which make men turn to God, are to be accepted as Pramanas. (72-83)

Prameya Section:

This section deals with the knowledge principles. Really speaking God alone is knowable. He is both qualified and non-qualified. He reveals Himself as qualities and actions. All the changes such as origination, existence, augmentation, decline, decrease and extinction are due to God's will. There are 28 knowable elements—as shown in chapter II. God has three different forms—one endowed with the power of action known in a Sacrificial form, the other endowed with power of knowledge, known as Brahman, and the third endowed with both—Work and Knowledge. The earlier part of the Vedas describes the action from, the latter part of the Vedas describes knowledge form of Brahman

The Gita and the Bhagavata teach work and knowledge both and in addition to the above love for God. God as sacrifice is to be attained by the performance of sacrificial ceremonies and as Brahman by knowledge, and God as Love by devotion which is love plus service.

The above 28 elements are of three kinds-physical, spiritual and divine. The world and the souls are manifested from God's Akshara-form, by His Will with the aid of Maya. His divine power Maya-Prakriti (World) and Purushas (souls) have been manifested from Akshara. Besides Akshara-form, God reveals, for the purpose of creation, time, action and nature. Akshara, Time work and nature are not to be included in the list of the Tattvas, because they do not constitute the causal form of God. The 28 (Tattvas) elements constitute effect (Karya) forms of God. They are universal (Samashti) and individual (Vyashti). They are physical as world and all inanimate objects, spiritual as souls, and transcendental as Akshara. Ultimate cause of all these diverse forms is God. It is God in every state and every activity—creative or destructive. God's power of manifestation and non-manifestation is at work respectively. Every change is due to God's will. The rise or fall of the individuals or of nations, is to be attributed to God's Will. The world is a theatre, where God enacts His own drama Himself playing the roles of various characters, for His pleasure. He is in all conditions of existence of things and non-existence, in the past and in the future. It is God's Hide and Seek play in the existence and non-existence of things. He becomes revealed in things having existence and hides Himeslf in things, not having existence. The world is the revelation of His existence aspect, the souls of the consciousness aspect. The Akshara represents Existence, consciousness plus finite Bliss. But Supreme God is perfect Bliss. He is called Krishna.

Akshara is to be attained by souls by means of knowledge. It is eternal (*Nitya*) and temporary (*Karya*). Eternal knowledge is revealed through God's grace, but it is not to be had by one's efforts. The second kind of knowledge is got by one's efforts.

The devotee's goal is to realise God who is higher than Akshara and enjoy His love, by his own love. (84-154). All modes of expressions which refer to existence or non-existence of the thing are in fact, indicative of God's power of revelation and non revelation, respectively. Not only clay and jar are real, but their so called existence is also real. All objects having names and forms are real. The form of an object enables one to cognise the object by its shape as a substance, its qualities and activities produced by it. The cognition of the names depends upon words, and letters composing the words, their inherent power and their connection in the sentence. Just as God has revealed His particular quality in the objects, so also God has revealed his power of sense in the words. In all there are three powers of senses in the words. Primary, Indicative and suggestive. Word being form of God, it possesses the power of sense by the Will of God. It is due to God's will, why a particular word in a particular context should convey particular meaning. Like the object-universe the word-universe, is real. Although we ordinarily understand the meaning of the words with the aid of grammar and lexicon, they are the instruments of God. All the scriptures and Literature constitute the word form of God. By its aid, the souls endeavour to free themselves from worldly bondage. The object universe is the cause of bondage and the word universe (the scriptures) is the cause of freedom. God enjoys His pleasure by these two universes, which exist in the world. Avidya, Prakriti and Maya are the three powers of God, Avidya belonging to the soul, Prakriti to Akshara and Maya to Krishna (Supreme God). The soul belongs to God, but having been separaed from God, forgets its relation to God, on account of ignorance (Avidya), but by true knowledge, this ignorance is removed. Knowledge is of two kinds—eternal (*Nitya*) and non-eternal (*Karya*). The latter arises from the development of the Sattvika intelligence. But this knowledge is of determinate nature. It makes one comprehend Reality, not as one, but as revealed in differences. It is of analytical and divided nature and the knowledge got through organs external orinternal is defective and fluctuating, and is easily vitiated; but the knowledge form (scriptures) is for ever the same. The scriptures reveal that only knowable principle is God. Even in the diversities of objects, it is God alone in them, who is to be known. The object-jar is not to be known as something separate from God; but as one revealing God. So the jar is to be cognised not in its jar form but God form. This is what we learn from the scriptures. It informs that God is one. All beings, conscious or unconscious in all conditions and situations, are expressive of God's Reality. This means that Reality is one and not many (83-184).

Sadhana Section: This section deals with means of religious life. Man's duties are of three kinds. His duties unto himself as an individual, duties unto society, and duty unto God. As he lives in the society, he must perform his duties unto the society. The duties of the class to which he belongs are social duties. Just as the origin of the world and the souls is due to the Will of God, so the origin of the classes and orders of life and their duties are due to the Will of God. After the separation of the souls, God gave them birth in a particular body and in a particular class with obligatory duties of that class. In all there are four classes—the Brahmanas, the Kshatriyas, the Vaisyas and the Shudras, which are based on the qualities of nature viz. Sattva, Rajas and Tamas and actions under their impact. Each man should strictly follow the duties belonging to his class. He should eke out his livelihood by avocation of his caste. A man's class is not determined by his birth, but by his qualities and actions. Similarly a man has specific duties for each particular order of life. In the first stage of life he is to equip himself with knowledge necessary for his duties, in the second stage of life as a householder. Having carried out family burden and procreated children, he should at the age of fifty, retire from active life and devote his life to the public good and practise religious discipline and in the last stage he should completely renounce the world and engage his mind in contemplation of God. These duties of the classes or of orders of life (*Asrama Dharmas*) have their ultimate end of realising God. They are intended to purify the mind so that one can offer devotion to God. These duties are to be regarded as duties unto God. They are fixed by God for the uplift of each man belonging to a particular category according to his innate tendencies and temperament. If these duties do not lead to the path of devotion they are of no use. If they interfere with devotion they should be at-once discarded.

Means for the Individual's Spirituality:

Action, Knowledge, Austerity and Mind-control are some of the means prescribed in the scriptures. Knowledge of other systems of Philosophy is not upto the mark as shown in chapter II of Section I.

Section on Devotion:

Knowledge develops spirituality in man, but devotion makes him fit for God-realisation. It is the best among the means taught by the scriptures. It is the Dharma which the soul owes unto God without which it cannot be united with God. It is both a means and an end. Devotion of Nine fold kind consisting of hearing, reciting and remembering qualities of God, saltuations, falling prostrate before the idol, worshipping, servitude, friendliness and dedication has a value as a means. Devotion of the type of love is not a means but an end in itself. Its goal is not salvation like the devotion of nine fold nature but love of God. It seeks God's love and grace by its love. Apart from enjoyment of God's love which is blessed to have by God's grace, it has no desire. But this devotion is not a blind emotion. In the beginning, it is intellectual love following knowledge of God's greatness from the study of the scriptures. It is not a temporary emotion but the deepest, firmest, and strongest kind of love triumphing over all other earthly loves.

In the Kali Age, devotion alone is the safest means as shown in chapters II & III of section I. There is no fear of fall or degradation in the path of devotion. If it succumbs to degradation it is only temporary in the form of a birth in low caste, but soon, it has redemption.

A true devotee is very rare. A devotee is free from pride and all sense of honour or disgrace. True devotion does not depend upon one's efforts. One does not get it by seeking it. It depends upon grace of God. Still it has to pass through some preliminary disciplines. Hearing, reciting and remembering God's praises, meditating upon God's Lilas, daily recital of the Bhagawata, contact with other devotees, service of God's idol and resorting to a peceptor who himself is a devotee of Krishna and is free from ambition and possesses spotless character and not only respects the Bhagavata but pores over it and ponders upon the Lilas of God depicted in it. Besides, he should cultivate power of tolerance, make contentment his virtue, and develop asceticism or indifference to the worldly possessions. When the soul passes through these preliminary disciplines, all its impurities are washed away and he becomes pure gold, fit to be fashioned into an ornament fit for the necklace of God i.e. it will acquire fitness for enjoyment of God's love. (209-255)

Section on Action: Different kinds of actions and their fruits are mentioned in this section. According to three qualities of Prakriti, there are three kinds of action and their subdivisions are shown in Chapter II and III of Section I. the *sattvika* actions secure heavenly happiness, but when the stock of merits gets exhausted there is a fall. Persons performing Vedic rituals are subject to rebirth. Those wishing for liberation, must betake to knowledge. However, the Vedic rituals have their utility. They tend to purify mind, which is necessary for knowledge and even for devotion. But they should be done without any desires. Those schools such as those of the Samkhya, Yoga., Buddhists, the Jainas and the Shaktas (worshippers of Shakti-goddesses) which condemn the Vedic rituals must be utterly ignored. These are enimical to the Vedas. The Vedas have to be respected but even the learned fail to grasp the spirit of the Vedic teaching. They only adhere to their letter. Conformity to the Vedas is absolutely necessary but it should be well remembered that the rituals taught by the Vedas are intended as aids to knowledge and devotion. It is the law of action that a man has to reap fruit for his work,-happiness or misery. But if a man does his work without desires and as dedication to God, the law of work does not apply to him. This is possible only by knowledge and devotion.

Section on Knowledge: This forms the last portion of this work. It explains the efficacy of knowledge. It is a means, no doubt good for spirituality, but compared with devotion it is inferior. Like Action,* it suffers from certain drawbacks. It is

---

* Nine kinds of Actions and their fruits:

Sattvika	— Sattvika	– Heavenly happiness
,,	Rajas–	Happiness on Mount Meru
,,	Tamas–	Happiness in the internal world
Rajas	Sattvika–	Happiness in the world of demons
Rajas	Rajas–	Happiness in the Moon world
Rajas	Tamas–	Happiness in the world of Yakshas (Semi Gods)
Tamas	Sattvika—	Happiness In the world of the Manes
Tamas	Rajas–	Happiness in the world of the spirits
Tamas	Tamas—	Happiness in the world of the snakes

human nature to seek happiness and avoid misery. Desire and love are incentives to happiness and hate and anger to misery. Ambition and infatuation are responsible for both happiness and misery. True knowledge is needed to regulate our passions, so that real happiness can be achieved and misery averted. So called worldly happiness is not true. It is temporary and mixed with misery. It cannot give peace and calmness to mind. Knowledge and devotion are the real ways to true happiness.

But it is not the verbal knowledge of the Upanishadic sentences like 'Thou art That, (*Tat Tvamasi*). There are three kinds of knowledge Direct, Indirect and Impersonal. Verbal knowledge is not direct as shown in Chapter II.

At most it can chase away grief but cannot free him from diseases and death. Again knowledge (Vidya) and Ignorance (Avidya) are the powers of God of opposite natures, one sublating the other. When knowledge is powerful, ignorance becomes powerless only for some time, but again ignorance becomes powerful and knowledge becomes powerless. Just as experiences of dream and waking state are opposed to each other, each is active at its own time, knowledge and ignorance both are active at their own times. So one cannot have complete knowledge. Perfection in knowledge is simply an ideal and not a practical reality. It is not within a man's reach. It means knowledge of Brahman, and not the knowledge of the self. When a man gets the knowledge of Brahman, he cognises God everywhere, and forgets the world. Such knowledge is not possible, unless ignorance is removed. But ignorance is due to the operation of Maya. So unless Maya is controlled, ignorance cannot be removed. To control and conquer Maya, devotion is the only way. One should therefore surrender oneself to God and love Him. By this way not only a seeker of God will be free from miserly, but will get permanent happiness in the form of enjoying God's love, and grace. Path of devotion does not require any means like rituals, knowledge, control of mind, penance, fasts, etc. It is a fearless path. It is supreme love for God-Krishna alone which is the real way for realisation of God. Ideal of life, according to Vallabhacharya, is Love for God. Vallabha after considering the views of other schools, expresses his opinion that their ideals are not practicable in this age. Men are too busy with other occupations and cannot find convenient conditions to achieve these ideals. Again these ideals are not only unrealisable due to weakness of human nature, but are also not helpful in securing happiness and quietism of a permanent character. In his opinion, Love for God, known as devotion, is not only a safe antedote against all ills, but a positive remedy to restore soul to its perfect health so that it can acquire fitness to be in the company of God in its individual character and enjoy His Love.

Here ends the second part of the Tattva Dipa Nibandha.

Bhagavatartha-Prakarana: This explains the philosophy of the Bhagavata, which Vallabha regards as the most authentic work on knowledge of God. Krishna who is described in the T.U. as Ananda (Bliss), Anandamaya or Rasa (Love) is Supreme Brahman, higher than Akshara or Brahman. The world and the souls are manifested from Akshara by His Will for His Lila or sport. The Vedas give general knowledge of Brahman and the means to attain it. The Gita differentiates Akshara from Purushottama and teaches devotion with selfless work and knowledge as a means for the attainment of Purushottama. But the Bhagavata describes only the Bliss or Love-form of God and His Lilas (sports) so that persons desirous of emancipation may learn about God's greatness, and turn to God. The Bhagavata is intended only for souls who seek God by the path of devotion and love dissociating themselves completely from worldly life.

The Bhagavata is a work in 12 books and 360 chapters composed by Badarayana Vyas—author of the Brahma Sutras in a poetic form. It is both religious and philosophical. Its philosophy is very hard to understand for ordinary readers. Vallabhacharya has made two separate attempts to explain it by the compilation of the *Bhagavatartha Prakarana* and the other *Subodhini* commentary. The Bhagavartha explains the meaning of the Bhagavata in four ways with reference to (1) Central teaching of the whole work (2) general meaning of each book (3) the purpose of each Prakaran—a group of chapters and (4) the idea of each chapter. In Subodhini, he explains the text verse by verse with reference to its words and letters. It is said that another commentary known as *Sukshama Tika* was also written by Vallabha on the Bhagavata, but only a fragment has been discovered. Subodhini commentary is available only on Books I, II, III, X and a small part of XI.

The Bhagavatartha Nibandha is written in the form of Karikas on all the books with Prakasha commentary by Vallabhacharya upto 33rd Karika of BK IV. His son Vitthalesha wrote Prakasha further upto the end of Book V. The remaining portion of the commentary under the name of *Nibandha Yojana* was written by Purushottamaji.

Commentaries: The following commentaries exist on this monumental work.

1. Avarana bhanga by Purushottamaji.
2. Tippani by Kalyanraiji (Unpublished)
3. Nibandha Yojana—by Lalu Bhatta.
4. Prakaran Vibhaga by Ghansyama Bhatta.
5. Adhyayartha—Gokulrai Bhatta.

The Aim of the Bhagavata is to describe the *lilas* of God Krishna who is perfection of Bliss and Love.

The work is divided into 12 books each describing particular *lila* or play of God, which begins from book III and ends in XII. The whole work establishes the following propositions: (1) Krishna who is bliss or Love is Supreme God. (2) He is to be attained by the highest kind of love. (3) This love is obtained only by God's grace. (4) Enjoyment of God's love is the principal goal of a devotee. (5) As a pre-requisite to securing God's grace, God's Refuge should be sought. (6) Supreme happiness is to be got from God who is perfect Bliss.

Analysis of the ideas in the Bhagavata according to the scheme outlined by Vallabhacharya in the Bhagavatartha Prakakasha:

Book I*

Fitness of the listeners and the reciters of the Bhagvata.

There are three types of the listeners and the reciters. [1] The infe-rior (1-3) [2] the mediocre (4-6) and [3] the superior types (7-19). The inferior listeners are inquisitive, free from jealousy, and are interested in hearing. The inferior reciters are versatile in the know- ledge of the Bhagwata, are proficient in it and possess even its secret. The mediocre listeners and the reciters are those on whom God has bestowed His Grace, and who have not only accepted God's servitude, but for them God is the only summum bonum of life. The superior class knows God as revealed in the Bhagavata.

---

* Nos, in [ ] brackets indicate subdivisions (*Prekarenas*), and in ( ) brackets indicate chapters (Adhyayas)

Book II

Means by which God is to be realised.

There are three means for realisation of God [1] Tattva Dhyana—meditation of the physical aspects and of the physical or subtle aspects (1-2), [2] cheerfulness of the heart (3-4) and [3] reflection on the creation (5-7) and the rational way (8-10)

Book III

Creation (*Sarga*)

It describes two kinds of creations—(1) creation by which the souls are bound in the worldly stage (1-19) and of the free souls (20-33). The first is treated in first Prakaranas under the heads of [1] transcendental creation (1-6), [2] creation due to the qualities of Prakriti, (7-9) [3] Time (10-11) [4-5] Free souls (12-19). The second kind of creation relating to free souls is treated in [6 to 10] Prakaranas under the heads of [6] Freedom from the Tattvas (20-24), [7] Time (25), [8] transcendental nature of freedom (26-27), [9] freedom from the qualities of the *gunas*, (28) and [10] freedom of the souls (29-33).

Book IV

Special Creation of the souls with their psychic characteristics and their goals in their worldly pursuits. (*Visarga*)

It has four Prakaranas dealing on [1] Dharma-religious duty in the form of 7 Vedic sacrificial ceremonies (1-7), [2] Artha (wealth) (8-12), [3] Kama-happiness (13-23) and [4] Moksha-liberation in the form of becoming Brahman or Sayujya-entry in Brahman (24-31).

Book V

Fixing of things in their peoper places by limitation of their functions and submitting them to rules of conduct. It reveals triumph of God's power over Nature and the souls. (*Sthana* or *Sthiti*)

There are two main divisions [1] The victory over-nature (1-24) and [2] The victory over souls (25-26) according to the conventional meaning of the word-*Sthana.*

Or

three—[1] fixing creatal beings according to place [2] time and [3] conscience according to the etymologiccal meaning of the word—*Sthana.*

Or

six sub-divisions [1] fixing mind in God through devotion (1-6), [2] mind-control (7-14), and [3] knowledge under Svarupa Sthiti (15) and three others stabilising God's existence [1] in this world (16-20), [2] the middle world (Ether) (21-23) and [3] the heavenly or upper world (24-26).

It throws immense light on the geographical and astronomical knowledge and also mentions the rules of conduct and functions of various classes for the harmony and order of the society. Each created thing and Being is endowed with a specific inherent quality for the divine sport (Lila). It ends with a teaching that the good will go to heaven and the wicked to the hell.

Book VI

Stating that all things go by the order and rules fixed by God, but sometimes in the case of God's favoured souls, exceptions are made. (*Poshana* or *Anugraha*)

Three ways for the grace of God are indicated—[1] way of listening, reciting and remembering name of God (1-3), [2] meditation way (4-17) and [3] Adoration or worship way (18-19).

Book VII

Desires (*Uti*)

Desires are of three kinds [1] good (1-5) [2] bad (6-10) [3] mixed (11-15). Happiness and misery spring from actions due to desires.

Book VIII

Manvantara **or** *Dharma.*

1 It is of three kinds-physical, spiritual and divine which connects with God (1-24).

Book IX

Contact with the sages and the spiritually advanced souls.

The aspirant of spiritual life must live in the company of the advanced souls and receive knowledge of God from them for removing misery–worldly bondage and obtaining happiness from God [1] Release from miseries (1—13), [2] Happiness (14-24).

Book X

Realisation of God through Love by mind, senses and the soul (*Nirodha*)

Prakaran [I] (1-4) describes Krishna's birth (revelation of God's Love-form) [2] (5-32) describes Nirodha of the Tamas devotees who are free from pride of knowledge and very obstinate in seeking God's love under four sub divisions-*Pramana,* (5-11) *Prameya* (12-18), *Sadhana* (19-25,) and *Fala* (26-32.)

[3] describes Nirodha of the Rajasa who while they love God are the Sattvika souls engrossed in the worldly affairs, and under the same sub-divisions, each of seven chapters (33-60).

In [4] Nirodha of the Sattvika souls, who, no doubt, have love for God but are clinging to knowledge. It has three sub-divisions of *Prameya, Sadhana* and *Fala* (61-81). Last Prakarana [5] is known as *Guna Prakarana,* which teaches

Nirodha by way of God's qualities - Greatness, Potency, Glory, Beauty, Knowledge and indifference to the world. (82-87).

Book XI

Liberation (*Moksha*)

It deals with the topic of [1] liberation with reference to souls through knowledge and devotion (1-27) and [2] with reference to Brahman (30-31.)

Book XII

Refuge of God (*Ashraya*)

5 It lays down that for liberation it is necesssary that the souls should resort to God. This topic is divided under five heads: [1] Through Krishna [2] through the world as God (4-5) [3] through the Vedas (6-7) [4] through devotion (8-10) and [5] through the Bhagavata. (11-13)

The teaching of the Bhagavata, according to Vallabhacharya is to get liberation by resorting to God, but for that one must have knowledge of God's greatness knowing His creative, preserving and destructive activities, and the way of seeking God's Grace, ending bad and mixed desires by nourishing good ones through religious practices, company of the sages and saintly persons and enshrining God in one's heart by Nirodha. The liberation aimed at is restoration of the soul to its pristine state-God state—in union with Him in which state the soul participates with God in His bliss.

Subodhini:

This is a commentary on the Bhagavata. A small fragment entitled *Sukshma tika* was published in the Magazine 'Pushti Sudha' some years back. The Subodhini is available only on the first, second, third and tenth Books of the Bhagavata, and only the initial portion of the 11th Book. This commentary is the most popular of Vallabhacharya's works. It explains the verse meanings, word meanings and sentence meanings. He explains each verse in reference to its context. The words are explained not only in the current sense but also with reference to their etymological meaning. Grammatical irregulatrities in the words of the text are explained, as having been used in the Vedic forms. The peculiarity of his commentary is that it explains the importance of each word in the verse. Its chief merit lies in bringing out the underlying meaning by a suggestive sense. As a contribution to the commentary, literature of the Bhagavata, it stands by itself, testifying to the writer's supergenius in revealing the beauty and glory of this most sacred work of the Hindus.

As the poet says, 'Heard melodies are sweet but those unheard are sweeter.' The Subodhini is full of unheard melodies. It is not exaggeration to say that it has no parallel in the commentary literature on the Bhagavata.

Not that the philosophical ideas have been elucidated but they are discussed fully with a view to comparing them with the ideas held by other commentators. It maintains the rule of proportion through out by restricting to the central idea of each verse and by being loyal to the text and its author.

The explanation of each chapter commences with some Karikas which contain the underlying meaning of each chapter. At times in order to make his meaning more explicit, he introduces some Karikas in the middle of the chapter. It is Vallabhacharya's greatest literary achievement, a fruit of his deep study. He considers the Bhagavata as the best of scriptures describing the sports of God Krishna to teach divine souls how to realise God. The commentary on the first and second books is written in a philosophical vein and the commentary on the 10th Book delineates the lilas (sports) of God who is love and Bliss. It is full of beauty in every part of it but the height of beauty is reached in the portions of the commentary relating to the *Venu Gita* (flute song), the Ras Lila portion and the Bhramara Gita (The Bee Song). In his Anu Bhashya and Tattva Dipa Nibandha, Vallabhacharya impresses on us only as a Philosopher interpreting the truths of scriptures in uninformity to their eternity, in his 'Sixteen Works' he teaches his followers the valuable doctrine of grace of God and the way to achieve it but in his Subodhini he does not pose to teach but as a mystic who has himself experienced God's love shows us how to experience it.

Patravalambanam: This work is a statement by Vallabhacharya written in reply to the Mimansakas and the Mayavadins to refute their theories of work and knowledge being the principal idea of the Vedas. Vallabhacharya says that they did not do justice to the Vedas. The sacrifice idea is explained in the Brahmanas and the Kalpa Sutras, the knowledge in the Upanishadas. The Mimansakas, relying upon the Purva Kanda, assert that the principle teaching of the Vedas is Dharma i.e. work or sacrifice; the Vedantins on the other hand hold that it is knowledge. Jaimini advocates his *Karma* theory in his Jaimini Sutras and Badarayana knowledge or Brahman in his Brahma Sutras. When Vallabhacharya was living in Charanadri near Benaras some Pandits of the Kumaul school of the Mimansakas and of the Mayavada school of Shamkaracharya approached him with a challenge to draw him into a controversy about the fundamental teachings of the Veda. Vallabhacharya was by this time busy with his other literary activities and was disturbed by the conduct of these Pandits, so, in order to silence them he noted their points and refuted them summarily in folios—which were attached to the door of the temple of Shri Vishvanath. From the hanging of the folios at the door of the temple it came to be known as Patravalamban.

It consists of 39½ stanzas—the major portion being in verse and the remaining in prose. It has commentaries by Purushottamji, Girdharji, Hariraiji and Balkrishnaji. It considers the claim of the Mimansaka school that the main teaching of the Vedas is Dharma. He says that in interpreting the Vedas one should not use one's own imagination. The words of the Vedas should be understood strictly in their original sense with the help of Panini's grammar. The Vedas do not lay emphasis on one to the exclusion of another. Dharma or action and Brahman or knowledge are both the powers of God. Both ultimately lead to a certain goal desired by their seekers. Those who desire heaven resort to sacrifice and those who desire salvation to knowledge of Brahman. Both are useful for the purification of mind. One who wants to know the central teaching of the Vedas must learn it from a preceptor who should thoroughly understand the Vedas with all their *angas*—auxiliary sciences and then teach his pupil. From the right study of the Veads one's understanding will be improved, so that the pupil will realise that there is oneness in the teaching. In fact there is no conflict between the action and knowledge, as Vedas teach both are of equal importance to an aspirant of spiritual life. Thus Vallabhacharya silenced the Mimansakas. He then refutes the Mayavadins who accept Brahman, but consider the world as unreal. They believe the ultimate—Reality to be destitute of attributes. The differences of the objects are due to Maya (Illusion or nescience) and so not real. Vallabhacharya refutes this theory and says that the world is the manifestation of God. All the things having names and forms express God's attributes though they apparently seem to be different from each other. (This has been fully explained in Chapter II). So considered this way all the objects though different in names and forms are one in their having the essence of the existence—*Sat* attribute—of God. The man of knowledge should undergo the discipline of action for purification of his mind and man of Karma should acquire knowledge for spiritual progress. He however advocates Bhakti principle as a means but here he does not say anything about it, because this work is written simply as a reply to the questions put to him by the *mimansaka* and *mayavadins*. He concludes this work by the statement that the scholars should listen to this because the responsibility of protecting the 'Right path of the Vedic teaching, lies on them.

Jaimini Sutra Bhashya: This is the work undertaken by Vallabhacharya to harmonise the teachings of the Purva Kanda and the Uttar Kanda of the Vedas. He criticises in it Jaimini's views and attempts correct interpretation. It is incomplete nor has it been completed like incomplete Anu Bhashya by his son Vitthaleshji. The sponsors of Dharma or action concept accept knowledge as subordinate to it and those of knowledge that action is subordinate to knowledge. Vallabhacharya holds the view that both are partially right. Really speaking the main teaching of the Vedas is Brahman. Work and knowledge are only the ways or means in spiritual life. They themselves are good for nothing if not related to God. Those who seek heavenly bliss from work and those who seek salvation from knowledge are mistaken. They have no clear conception of their final goal which is the attainment of Supreme God. Jaimini applied the Vedic authority in support of his Work or sacrifice theory. It is nothing but a distortion of the Vedic meaning as he relies only upon one part of the Vedas and disregards the other. This is doing injustice to the Vedas. Vallabhacharya was deeply touched at this wilful distortation and manipulation of the Vedas. He therefore wrote his Bhashya on the Sutras (aphorisms) of Jaimini. Vallabhacharya desired by this work, and his Bhashya on the Brahma Sutras, that the two independent works, one by Jaimini and the other by Badarayan, are not to be considered as opposite and irreconcilable. Both of them constitute an integral part of one science teaching the way of God-realisation. It consists of 42 introductory verses and the commetary on the Bhavartha Pada (II-1). This incomplete work has been commented upon by Purushottamji. Vallabhacharya does not follow Shabarswamy's interpretation of the Sutras but has his independent interpretation strictly in conformity with the Vedic texts. He differs from Shabaraswamy in explaining the word "*Vidhi*". It is regarded as prompter by the latter, but Vallabha asserts that the *Vidhi* by itself cannot be a prompter. The real prompter is God. Had this work been completed it would have been a wonderful work like his *Anu Bhashya.* He is the only philosopher on Indian soil who has restored harmony between the opposite schools of thought.

Sixteen Works

These are small and 16 in number, hence they all collectively taken together, are known as Sixteen Works. They are intended only for the followers of the Pushti Marga. They teach them their duties as devotees of Krishna.

Vallabhacharya deals with the problem of Reality in his Anu Bhashya in a *Praman* way, in the Tattva Dip Nibandha in a *Prameya* way, in his Sixteen Works in a *Sadhana* way and in his Subodhini on the Bhagavata in a *Fala* (Goal) way.

The following is the summary of the sixteen works.

(1) **Yamunashtaka:** The first work in the series is the Yamunashtaka written in praise of the river Yamuna on whose banks Krishna had a dance with Gopis. It symbolises continuous flow of love for God. It is the means of soul's union with God. It rejuvenates the soul of the devotee, by making it divine and strong for communion with God. It promises the devotee with eightfold strength. (1) fulfilment of all the desires of the devotee in enjoying God's love (2) increase of love (3) purity of mind (4) fitness (5) equality with God in love relation (6) avoidance of hindrances

in love (7) exaltation and (8) endearment to God. It purifies body, mind and senses, and imparts fitness to the devotee for the enjoyment of God's love. The devotee has no other desire except union with God, enjoyment of God's love which requires purification of heart, and change of nature.

There are four commentaries on it by Vitthaleshji, Hariraiji, Purushottamji and Dwarkeshlal respectively.

(2) **Balbodha:** As its title suggests it is intended as extortation to juniors in spiritual life. The word Bala is to be understood not in the sense of those who are children by age, but those seekers of spiritual life who are as yet in the infant state mentally, as their spiritual sense is not sufficiently developed to understand from the scriptures what the real goal of life is. It is with reference to such souls that he points out briefly the various goals of life (*Purushartha*) and evaluates them and ultimately concludes that they are defective in reaching the Supreme God. The teaching of this work equips one with the elementary knowledge which paves the way for initiation into the path of Divine grace. The work consists of 19 verses and three commentaries—(1) Prakasha by Devakinandana (2) Vivaran by Goswami Purushottamaji and (3) Tika by Dvarkeshaji-have been written on it shedding light on the meaning intended to be conveyed by the author. In the second verse, the author announces his intention of undertaking the consideration of four principal goals of human life to the achievement of which efforts of men and women are directed. These goals or purposes of life are principally four (1) righteousness (*Dharma*) (2) wealth (*Artha*) (3) happiness (*Kama*) and (4) Salvation (*Moksha*). Fame, power, desire for children are included under wealth. Any of these four singly or in conjunction with others make life worth living. Destitute of these purposes, life has no significance. The wheels of life are lubricated by oil in the form of these purposes. But Vallabhacharya says, one must understand the value of these and that how far they can be useful in their spiritual development. He therefore classifies them under two main categories (1) Vedic i.e. considered by the Vedas (2) *Laukika*—considered by the sages. He proposes in this work only to consider the *Laukika Purusharthas.* Even here he would restrict himself only to the consideration of the *Moksha Purushartha,* as that is

the real goal of the aspirants of spiritual life. Those who are interested in seeking *Dharma*, *Artha* and *Kama*, should understand their nature and the ways to attain them from the *Smriti* works, from Brihaspati, and Chanakya and Vatsyayana respectively. He says that there are two ways of attaining the goal of Moksha by one's own self and through others. The first way is that of the Samkhya and Yoga, and the second that of favour from Gods. (Vishnu and Shiva). The Samkhya way is the way of Tyaga or renunciation of all desires and freedom from I-ness and mine-ness. The Yoga does not require renunciation in the above sense, still it requires inner or mental renunciation and practising of the eight fold discipline such as *Yama*, *Niyama* etc. as prescribed by Patanjali in his Yoga Shastra. These two ways are difficult and full of perils. The way of getting salvation by the help of others i.e. Gods is better than that of self-help. As human beings, men's efforts, however supreme, are liable to hindrances and frustration but what seems difficult to attain by self-help will become easily attainable, if Gods will do favour. There are many Gods but only Shiva and Vishnu can help here. Since Shiva himself is a devotee of Vishnu, he is unable to fulfil the devotee's desire for salvation. He can give happiness. So the proposition established in this work is that to get salvation one must be devoted to Vishnu, He is then pleased with the devotee by his nine fold devotion as shown in Chapter II. Self-dedication is the best to get salvation from Vishnu, for one who is on the path of Maryada i.e. the spiritual path of knowledge and nine fold devotion. It should be noted here that Vallabhacharya does not recommend this path as the only reliable one to the Pushti souls, who depend upon the grace of God. These souls are of higher type than the souls of the Maryada kind.

(3) **Siddhanta Muktavali** contains 21 verses. and receives attention of eight scholars viz. Gokulnathaji, Kalyanrai, Purushottamaji, Vallabhji, Vrajanatha, Lalu Bhatta, Dvarkaeshaji and Hariraiji, who have enhanced its value by writing commentaries. It is named as the Necklace of the Doctrines. Here Vallabhacharya expounds some fundamental doctrines of his Philosophy. At the end of Balbodha, he reached to the conclusion that if salvation is the goal and if it is desired to be sought from any Deity, then it must be sought from Vishnu through Nine-fold

devotion. In this work, he goes further and makes an emphatic assertion that Vishnu is not the Supreme god. It is Krishna. So a devotee of God who wishes to realise Him, must offer service to Krishna, with submission and selfless love. The Service (*seva*) is the right love and the right way of realising Him. But that is not worship or Prayer. It is a mental act in which the mind of the devotee completely penetrates in the form of Krishna. 'Seva means *Pravana*—penetration of the mind in God's form or its interweaving with God, so that the mind does not think of any thing else but God. Even when engaged in worldly activities the mind is focussed on God. The devotee must be God-minded. This *Seva* is of three kinds—*Tanuja* (to be done with body), *Vittaja* (to be done with money) and *Mansi* (mental). The last one is the best. But for the devotees in the worldly state, it is not easy to acquire it. He should, therefore, do it with body and money. These two assist in the acquisition of the mental state of *Seva*—the last phase. Vallabhacharya then explains why he considers Krishna as Supreme God. To make his theory clear, he says that God has three forms like the river Ganges—the physical (*Ahdibhautika*), the spiritual (*Adhaytmika*) and the divine (*Adhidaivika*), as shown in Chapter II. Like these three forms of the Ganges, God also has three forms—the physical (the world), the spiritual (*Akshara*), and Divine (Krishna). God is described in the Upanishadas as *Sat-chit-Anand* (Being, consciousness and joy).

This God is not the highest one. The highest God is perfect Joy and known as Krishna. The 'being' aspect is manifested in the world, the consciousness in the souls, and joy in the *Akshara*. But the joy of *Akshara* is limited—finite. Vallabhacharya names it as *Brihat*, but distinguishes it from Krishna by characterising it as *Satchidanandaka*. The affix '*Ka*' is added to '*Sacchidananda*' to imply the sense of inferiority of *Akshara* to Krishna who is *Parmananda*—Perfect joy. In this work Vallabh briefly refers to the views of other theories but attaches no value to these views. He upholds what is known as *Brahmavada*, which believes in Brahman as the ultimate principle and the root-cause of the universe. It is manifested from God, by God Himself for His own pleasure (V. 4). Krishna is the Supreme God, so the seeker of God should fix his mind in Krishna freeing himself from I-ness and Mine-ness. He should not serve God for the fulfilment of his desires for worldly things, otherwise he will be miserable. God should be served for love of God. God being the protector of such devotees, His love only will make them free from the worldly bondage. God is pleased not by knowledge or worship but by selfless devotion and *seva* which alone is instrumental to the winning of His Grace. The seeker of God's grace should serve Him by love.

(4) Pushti Pravaha Maryada: This work consists of 25 verses and is commented by 4 writers—Sri Gokulnathaji, Raghunathaji, Kalyanraiji and Pitambaraji. From the statements of these commentators, it is believed to be incomplete. Its aim is to classify the souls and mention the characteristics of their natures, behaviour and the goals. Intrinsically all souls are alike. They are the *amshas*—parts of God, representing His being and consciousness. But in their worldly state they betray differences due to ignorance, in their nature, behaviour and pursuits. Some are engrossed in the worldly affairs and they are mad after worldly possessions such as wealth, power, fame etc. Their outlook of life is materialistic. These souls are worldly souls, called Pravaha. There are other spiritual souls of higher type, who despise the worldly possessions, but follow the scriptures and regulate their behaviour. They can discriminate what is beneficial to them and what is not. They are not slaves of social customs or conventions but conform to the authority of the scriptures and the counsels of wise men. They have no selfish motives. Their pursuits are intended for the goal of others and of their own soul. Such souls are known as Maryada souls. Maryada means Law. Their life is not lawless or wilful. They are religious minded. Their way of life is described in Chapter II. They perceive unity of God in all the diverse forms. Superior to these and the highest of all are the Pushti souls who live only for the Pushti (grace) of God. They despise worldly possessions and are indifferent even to Moksha. Their aim is participation in the joy of God in the state of union with God. They (The Pushti souls) are dearest to God because they have nothing in their life except love of God. They are created for the service of God alone. But all the souls falling under the Pushti divison are not alike. They have also differences among them. Vallabha therefore divides all Pushti souls into two broad divisions-(1) Pure Pushti souls and (2) Mixed Pushti souls. (These divisions are fully explained in Chapter II of Sect. I).

(5) **Siddhanta Rahasyam:** Secret of the Doctrine, a small work, has only 8 verses, but is very important, as within a small compass of these verses, Vallabhacharya elucidates the importance and significance of his fundamental Doctrine of Dedication to God. It has received utmost attention of the commentators which is evidenced by the fact that 11 commentataries have been written on it. In Siddhanta Muktavali he propounded two main doctrines (1) That Krishna is Supreme God and that the seekers of His Grace should render service to him. In Pushti Pravaha Maryada, he distinguishes different kinds of souls and asserts that only Pushti souls are fit as recepients of God' Grace. Vallabhacharya's faith is known as Pushti Marga. or Bhakti Marga. It differs from other Bhakti Margas by the fact that in his cult the Bhakti has no force at all in getting God's grace. Only love-devotion is acceptable to him and that too not as a means, for the achievement of any objectives. His love-devotion has the goal of the enjoyment of God's love and participation in His joy through His Grace, which does not come to all. Only selected souls who have reached the plane of Pushti devotion are considered fit for it. Vallabhacharya says that the Grace depends upon God's choice or '*varana*'. God expects preliminary preparation of the souls, their utmost faith in God's almightiness, by absolute surrender and accepting God's servitude by the vow of Dedication. Then only the soul becomes fit for initiation in the Pushti Marga. These two ceremonies are attended by two *Mantras*—(1) *Sharan Mantra* and (2) the *Nivedana Mantra*. The first consists of eight letters which is translated as 'Krishna is my refuge', the other consists of five letters which is translated as "Oh Krishna', I am your Servant." The first one has to precede the second which is to be gone through at any time, when the soul has developed sufficient understanding to grasp the meaning of the vow to be taken. The second ceremony is more serious and important. It is gone through before the idol of God, usually through the priest or Acharya of the faith. The *Nivedan Mantra* otherwise called *Brahma Sambandha Mantra* is in the form of a vow, by which the devotee dedicates himself and all his belonging to God. He accepts God as his Master and considers his all, as God's and not his, using them in the service of God. He considers his family and wealth as God's and uses them in God's service. These two cere-

monies are incumbent upon the fresh entrants of the sect. The first ceremony in the form of declaration of the acceptance of God's surrender by the soul, is simply the ceremony of its recognition in the sect. The second is an oath of consecration as purificatory process by which the soul is to be freed from all kinds of sins. Without this purification, the Pushti soul is not deemed fit for the service of God, it being a mode of restoring the soul's relation to God. He then explains the necessity of this ceremony as in Chapter III of Sec. I. For bringing the separated souls back to God, Vallabha finds out first the way of surrender and of dedication to God, to make them conscious of their relationship with God. It explains the importance and significance of *Atma Nivedan* (Self dedication or consecration to God). This was suggested to him from the Bhagavata XI th Book. The same was delivered as a message by God to him on the 11th day of the Bright half of the month of Shravan, by his personal revelation to him. *Atma Nivedan* also constitutes a part of the Nine fold devotion, but Vallabha makes it the foundation of the love of God. He mentions that there are five kinds of souls due to nature or birth, place, time, associations and contacts as mentioned in the Vedas and recognised by the world. Different commentators give different explanations of these but Gokulnathji, considers them as due to five kinds of superimpositions of nescience as shown in Chapter II & III. To be free from them, the souls should take a vow of dedication to God and transfer their ownership to God. He should feel that he is a servant of God, and he has no right to use them for his own purpose. He should ever remember that he is in this world to fulfil God's mission as his humble servant. God is the master of all the things in the world and the souls in their embodied condition should behave like faithful servants who do not misuse the property of the master for their own purpose. Vallabhacharya ends this work with the remarks that just as the waters of the rivulets with all their qualities (good or bad) lose their individual characteristics after entering into the river Ganges, so all the things dedicated to God become divine. The souls with their I-ness and mine-ness are purified and shine out with the glory of God and regain their divinity.

The word *Brahma Samabandha* means, connection or relation or union with God. Brahman is to be understood in the sense of

Supreme God (Krishna). This can be compared with the marriage ceremony of the bride and bridegroom. The souls are brides and God is bride-groom.

(6) **Navaratna:** The devotee seeking the love of God should be completely free from all kinds of cares, worries, and anxieties. Vallabhacharya teaches this in the Navaratna of 9 verses each of which is like a gem, being the most precious teaching.

It is said that this work was written by Vallabhacharya for his disciple Govinda Dave. For some time his mind was distracted and so he could not do service to God in a satisfactory way. He, therefore, sought guidance from Vallabhacharya who solved his puzzle by pointing out the fundamental tenet of a votary belonging to Pushti Marga, to have full trust in God as his protection in all matters. Although primarily meant for Govind Dave, it is meant for all the followers of Pushti Marga. A follower of Pushti Marga cannot cut off his connection with the world. In the first place he has obligations to his family, which require money for which he must work. The time to be devoted to the service of God is given to the pursuit of earning. This is against the spirit of the vow of dedication. If he is rich then, his mind may be at rest to a certain extent, but then there will be many other worries troubling his mind. This will prey upon his mind and cause distractions, interfering with his *Seva*. Sometimes he may feel that since he has dedicated all that he calls his own property etc. to God, he has no right to use it to supply the needs of himself and his dependents. After he has transferred his ownership to God, he cannot use it, for his own purpose. Some times, if his soul is highly developed in devotion to God, his mind will not have any distractions from worldly considerations. The only wish of his life is the realisation of God, but when he finds that it is delayed by God his mind suffers acute pain. There may be many other factors causing distraction in his mind and troubling him with cares and anxieties. Due to these it is but natural that he cannot devote his time to the service of God. This is the question posed here and Vallabhacharya answers it in this work. A devotee should not give way to concern of any kind,

1. As he has taken a vow of dedication, he should not think of his circumstances, as that betrays distrust in God.

2. He should know that whatever he does here is God's work. It is for God to make his circumstances favourable or otherwise.

3. Appreciation of service by God in the form of His grace, does not depend upon the means by which service is rendered. In the absence of any means, the service may be offered mentally with the heart teeming with love.

4. As a servant of God, he should look upon God as his Master and vigilant protector.

5. Again he should note that God will not give worldly position to a devotee in the path of Pushti. The Pushti soul yearns for the Grace of God in the form of its participation in God's joy or His realisation. He may therefore, sometimes deprive the devotee of his worldly means or create conditions not congenial to him deliberately, because He wishes to uplift him from the worldly state to the divine plane in His presence.

6. He should remember that this world is created by God for His play who makes or mars the things according to His will to suit His purpose.

7. If one's body, mind, material things etc. are not used in God's service but are used in other ways, that should not be the matter of concern, because everything in this world belongs to God and is connected with Him. So things used for them after consecration are to be considered as used for God.

8. Whenever the mind suffers distractions he should remember the holy Mantra—"Krishna is my Refuge" and Krishna will guide him.

Vitthaleshaji the son of Vallabhacharya has written a very lucid commentary on it and Purushottamaji, Vallabhaji, Murlidharji and Lalu Bhatt have also done so, following Vitthaleshaji.

(7) **Antah Karana Prabodha** (Exhortation to Heart):

This small work consisting of 10 verses is composed by Vallabhacharya as an address to his own heart but it is also meant for all his followers. In *Nava Ratna* he gave advice to his followers that they should not let cares and anxieties prey upon their mind under any happening and circumstances and deter them from offering service. But it might happen in the case of some specially favoured souls, who are stationed on the highest plane of divine life to ignore the behests of God, received intuitively for specific purpose from other motives. This is disregard of God's behests, tantamount to deliberate violation and the flouting of God's authority. It will be the cause of remorse in the mind of the devotee. Should such a devotee feel remorse by repentence? Should he curse himself under the belief that God has rejected him as his favoured one? Even here Vallabhacharya says that the devotee of God should trust in God and continue to love Him and offer service. It is said that the occasion for the composition of this work is connected with a personal incident in his own life. It was Vallabhacharya's strong belief that his mission of life, as an Acharya, was to preach Love for God to all whom he thought worthy of God's Grace. For this, he wrote Anu Bhashya, Tattva Dipa Nibandha and other works. He then undertook the stupendous task of writing his commentary Subodhini-and when he reached the end of the third chapter, he heard the call of God that he should give up literary activity and dedicate his life in experiencing love for God. This was the first call heard by him at the confluence of the Ganges and the ocean. Even while he was busy with writing works, his mind was feeling pang of separation from God. His heart's constant yearning was to be blessed with the revelation of God and enjoy the bliss of His love in union with Him. This feeling rose very high, and he interpreted it as God's command to be free from his literary activities. Yet he thought that it was his primary duty to expound the true meaning of the scriptures to his followers, so that they may not be led away by the Mayavadins and shun the path of Pushti. So he took up the task of writing Subodhini which embodied the teachings of the *Bhakti Marga.* When he reached the end of the third book again intuitively heard the call of God at Madhuwan to leave and return to God. But he felt that if he left the Bhagavat thus at the end of the third book, the very-important tenth book in which Krishna's sports have been described, will remain unexplained, and people will miss the real interpretation of God's *lilas.* He, therefore, in the interests of his followers disregarded it, but when he completed his Subodhini on Xth Book and was about to begin it on the XIth, he heard it again. This time he made up his mind to devote his time in the service of God and enjoy the bliss of God's proximity aesthetically.

This work makes reference to this incident and expresses Vallabhacharya's feeling that, even in such cases the devotee should not feel cut off from God's Grace. He gives the following reasons:

1. Such violations of God's behests are also due to God's Will.
2. The devotees should remember the example of the milk maids of Gokul, who did not obey Krishna when He first called them to Him and then admonished them to go back.
3. By such acts, God tests the love of the devotees.
4. The devotees are like Chandali—a scavenger woman—before accepted by God in the Pushti Marga. By birth she is a low caste woman discarded by the society, but when she is fortunate to be taken into favour by king, she is promoted to the exalted position. The king admits her to his harem as a queen, and showers his favours on her. But if on account of her own fault or due to the will of king, she is driven out from the palace, she should not feel sorry because she is reverted to her original state. She has lost nothing from her original status, so also the devotees should think of their original status, and compromise with the new situation, even if they are thrown out from God's favour and should love God.
5. It is the primary duty of the devotees to obey the command of God, under all circumstances.
6. The devotees should engage their body in the service of God. The souls are the brides of God. The marriage ceremony was performed at the time of initiation. The service of God should follow the initiation but much time is wasted in worldly pursuits, neglecting service of God. Vallabhacharya says this is not proper. He, who, neglects service of God will not receive His favour.

(8) Viveka-Dhairya-ashraya:

This is a work containing 17 verses. It has 4 commentaries on it. It prescribes an ethical code for the conduct of the devotees of God. Although the devotees who are entirely devoted only to the service of God are not concerned with social and moral rules, they have to cultivate some virtues which will guide them in their devotional life to achieve the goal of securing the Grace of God. The Bhagavad Gita mentions some divine virtues such as fearlessness, purity of heart, charity, control of the senses, truth, non-violence etc. The devotees are supposed to have developed those virtues, but here it is implied that for the grace of God, these three virtues—*Viveka* (discrimination, understanding) *Dhairya* (Patience) and *Ashraya* (Refuge of God) are the most essential. All happenings are due to His Will. It is therefore, the duty of a devotee to submit to His Will and to be free from egoism. It is God's will which makes him do all work and brings happiness or misery. A man by his own self is unable to do anything.

The second virue is *Dhairya* or patience or bearing the three fold (bodily, mental and spiritual) misery during one's life. The bodily misery should be borne thinking it worthless like wheng. The misery on account of one's passions in the form of insult, dishonour etc. should be also borne without making one's mind ruffled like Jad Bharat who bore insults from King Rahugana. The spiritual misery due to God's will in delaying His Grace, should also be borne like the milk maids of Gokul, who were forsaken by God after making them participants in His Divine joy. If any remedy is found by God's Will for any of these sufferings the devotee should not hesitate in making use of it. In all conditions of life and in all relations, one should remember the fact that it is God's will, that ordains the affairs and he must take it as Grace of God. No prayer should be offered to God for protection against the calamities and no complaints should be made charging Him with partiality and ruthlessness.

The third rule for the devotee's life is *Ashraya*. God should be accepted as sole refuge in the evils of this or the next world. Having once resorted to God, the devotee should give up worshipping or praying any other person. In all matters the devotee must have full trust in God and should do his work, thinking it to be God's work. If he has to suffer in it he should consider it as due to God's Will, and as His Grace.

(9) **Chatushloki** is a small work containing only four verses but it is pregnant with the philosophy of life of an ideal follower of Pushti Marga. In the *Balbodha,* Vallabhacharya referred to the four kinds of *Purusharthas* and stated that from the standpoint of a man of the world, salvation is the best Purushartha and to attain it one should be devoted to Vishnu. In this small work, he refers to the Purusharthas of the ideal follower of the Pushti Marga. He does not desire any worldly or heavenly happiness or attainment of the yogic powers or salvation also. He loves God so ardently that he scorns all these and derives happiness in the enjoyment of God's love. To Him God is his summum bonum. Vallabhacharya elsewhere defines these *Purusharthas* of a *Pushti* devotee, stating that accepting the condition of God's service as his servant is *Dharma* (Duty), God Himself as his *Artha* (Wealth), the desire to have vision of God is *Kama* and belonging to Him is salvation (Moksh). The Chatushloki elucidates these four *Purusharthas.* This work has 7 commentaries.

(10) **Krishnashraya:** This work of 11 verses and with 7 commentaries, gives reasons why a devotee should shun all other means and seek refuge in God. First 10 verses state the reasons and the last one is the conclusion. The reason why it has 10 verses is explained by the commentators as suggestive of six means of Action viz. place, time, materials, holy mantras, agent and action plus four *Purusharthas* or it refers to 10 kinds of devotees. He means to say that God alone is Refuge for the performers of Vedic rituals or the devotees. The reasons are given as under:—

1. The present Age is called *Kali Yuga* (Iron Age), in which all good paths for religious life have disappeared and everywhere one finds hypocrisy. 2. The holy places have become unholy. 3. Even a holy place like the Ganges has been surrounded by wicked people. 4. The *Mantras* have lost their effectiveness due to lack of knowledge. They cannot give protection. 5. Even the learned people are intoxicated with pride and lead sinful lives. 6. The vedic rituals—including fasts and vows have lost their value due to differences of beliefs. 7. From an example of Ajamila, it is proved

that Krishna alone is the saviour, even of sinners. 8. All Gods except Krishna possess limited powers. Even Akshara is limited. Krishna alone possesses Infinite powers and perfect joy. 9. None except Krishna can uplift devotees devoid of *Viveka, Dhairya* and *Ashraya*. 10. Krishna is all powerful and the giver of all good things.

(11) Bhakti Vardhini: This is a work of 11 verses indicating the way for the development of *Bhakti* (Devotion). Devotion is of two kinds—*Sadhan Rupa* (Nine-fold devotion) and *Sadhya Rupa* (expressed through love). The first is considered as a means like knowledge etc., the second is as an end in itself. To acquire fitness for the grace of God, the devotee should have love for God. This love is a spontaneous feeling, which should not remain static but should grow from more to more like a plant or a tree, which springs from a seed. But if the seed is not strong enough, its growth will be stunted. Such a plant will have only a short period of existence. Care should be taken to keep the seed of devotion strong by means of renunciation, hearing (*Shravan*) and singing praises of God. The devotee should stay at home and be engaged without any distractions, in worship, hearing etc. Inspite of distractions, he should not give up concentrating his mind in God. Thus only love for God will spring in his heart. There are three phases in the development of devotion—Sneha, Asakti and Vyasana. When devotion culminates into *Vyasana*, it is a sign of the fruition in the form of the Grace of God. His love for God, reciprocated by love of God is a reward in itself. These three stages are distinguished by their characteristics mentioned in verse 4. In Vyasana, the devotee completely forgets the world and fixes his mind only in God by complete detachment from the worldly state. When he enters this stage, God Himself comes to him, and showers and pours His Grace on him, so that the devotion now reaches the climax and its ultimate goal. God—the Ultimate Reality—is identified with Krishna in the Geeta. There Krishna says to Arjuna that he is the Supreme Reality, omnipotent, omiscient, and all pervading. He is endowed with six attributes of greatness, potency, glory, beauty, knowledge and disgust for the world. He is the majestic ruler and master of the world, superior to Akshara, which is no doubt Being, Consciousness and Joy form of God, yet its joy is limited. He is designated in the T. U.

as *Rasa*—Love and is perfect joy. This being the conception of God according to Vallabhacharya, He is to be realised or His joy is to be experienced by the devotee by love that transcends all other kinds of love. The devotee must love God for His own sake in the state of Union with God and listening to or singing praises of God when not engaged in service. —the separation. The *Vyasana* however is the final stage in which the devotee's soul achieves its object of participation into the joy of God, with Him. It is the state when the devotee cannot bear separation from God even for a moment. In this stage, the devotee's soul is completely detached from the world and comes very close to God, so that God is drawn to him, by the force of his extreme love for Him. This means that the world must be completely renounced and one's mind must be thinking of God and God alone. For this he should cut off all the ties of family life and social relations. He should live only in the company of the devotees who have acquired God's Divinity, far from busy throngs of man, in holy places where there is complete immunity from all external distractions. If one fears the possibility of distractions even in secluded places, the idea of residing there should be given up and one should stay in convenient place relying on a God as Protector. He should remember that God will not forsake the devotee's soul, when once its love is accepted by Him. In this work Vallabha vouches for the fact that the soul's devotion expressed through love-developing through *Sneha*, *Asakti* and *Vyasana* will be appreciated by God.

(12) Panch Padyani: This is a small work of five verses only. Among the hearers of God's praises, all are not equally worthy. Some may hear for selfish ends, some for spirituality, and a few for pure love of God. The hearers in the path of devotion are of two kinds—the Pushti, and the Maryada hearers. Vallabhacharya enumerates them here with their characteristics. He has classified one as the Pushti type and three as sub-types of the Maryada. They reveal the following characteristics:-

(1) **Pushti hearers:** These are those whose minds are immersed deeply in experiencing Rasa (love) of God. They are free from worldly loves. They are distressed mentally because they feel that they have not been fortunate in having proximity with

God and enjoying the bliss of His joy. They also avoid seeking happiness from worldly things or Vedic means.

(2) The Maryada hearers: These of the Middle type no doubt feel God and get enraptured at the remembrance of God but their aim is to get salvation.

(3) The low type: They know Krishna only as a *Tattva*—as a pervading spirit and not as Rasa or Love. Their love is only a temporary emotion. Their attachment to the world is not gone. They at times hanker after and are attached to worldly things. Hearing of God's praises is not a permanent feature of their devotion. They oscillate between God and the world.

(4) The high type: These devotees are engaged in hearing God's praises in all conditions of place, time and circumstances. Their devotion is single minded.

Here one point should be noted that the Pushti hearers love Krishna in His Rasa (Joy) form and that the lowest type of the Maryada hearers, as *Tattva* (an all-Perveding Spirit). The Pushti hearer hears the praises for his love of God, without any other motive. The high type of the maryada hearers value vedic means although their heart is filled with love. The mediocre hearers for salvation. The low class shows tendency to hear only at particular times. The seed of devotion is to be strengthened by the hearing of the Pushti type.

(13) Jalbheda: This work is written to enumerate different kinds of singers of God's praises and their characteristics. These are not all alike. They have among them good souls as well as bad. The hearers, before, they associate with any reciters of God's glorious deeds, must know their nature, not to be misdirected. Vallabhacharya gives 20 types according to their *bhava* or love for God. The title of the work means different kinds of waters. On the analogy of waters, Vallabhacharya analyses the *bhava* or love of the reciters or singers as under:-

1. The Well like type—These Gandharvas are professional singers. There are some good Gandharvas, who sing for nobler purposes of enlightening and entertaining their hearers and purifying them. Well waters are also of different kinds—some dirty, some pure, some beneficial to health, and some harmful.

2. The Channel type: The channel waters are used for watering the fields for the growth of crops. They have to be dug out from earth after hard labour before used. The reciters or narrators of the epics are like these channel-waters. The hearers can derive benefit of teaching from them, after a long time.
3. The field water type: The epic reciters and the singers, if addicted to the worldly happiness, are generative of Samsar like field waters, producing seeds for future crops. There is no cessation of Samsar or worldly bondage in their case.
4. The pit water type includes the singers who are in illicit connection with prostitutes of immoral women. Waters of a pit are dirty, unfit for drinking. The *bhava* of this type is also dirty and impure.
5. The Deep pit—water type includes those who sing praises of God as means for livelihood. The waters in a deep pit are dirty and untouched by others. These persons are impure and selfish.
6. The pool water type: The Pandits or the learned are like the waters in the pools on the bank of the river. This water is cool. The minds of the learned who are versed in the scriptures relating to the knowledge of God are cool minded and not excitable at any time.
7. The Suda water type: Suda means a kind of well having good waters. It differs from ordinary wells which are circular. They are square. Ordinary wells have no steps to enter them but these have steps. The learned who are grave and deep thinkers and are able to solve the doubts of hearers are compared with them.
8. The lake-type: Their minds are placid and unruffled like the lake-waters. Their love is full of excellence like the lake waters filled with the perfume of lotuses.
9. The Pond type: This class is represented by the so called learned whose knowledge is very limited, superficial and shallow and whose love is temporary. Their love is like the water of the pond which gets agitated when any men or cattle enter it for bathing or washing.

10. The Puddle type: The puddles are small ponds with a little water. The devotion and knowledge of these reciters is limited, though their actions (*Karmas*) are pure.

11. The Rain-water type: They are those who resort to Yogic disciplines. Like the rain waters falling in monsoon only, they behold God only in the condition of *Samadhi*.

12. The perspiration type: These are those who practise austerities and torment their bodies and senses. Just as perspiration issuing from the body is useless as water, so the penances, knowledge and the Yogic disciplines involving capacity of hard endurance are useless as means, in the attainment of God.

13. The waterfall type: These reciters praise God with the knowledge of God through His Grace. They can be recognised from the words they speak, like the waterfalls which can be known by the sounds of the falling waters. The speech of these reciters is sweet and pleasing employed only in the extolling of God's praises.

14. The Dewdrops type: These are those who do not worship God but the *Vibhutis* of God. Their love is also useless like the dew drops clinging to earth.

15. The rivulet type: They are those who extol God's praises through nine fold devotion as means. The rivulet waters increase in rains, and become dry in summer. The love of such reciters increases and decreases like that.

16. The constant water type: Their love is mechanical and routine like neither increasing nor decreasing. It is based upon the scriptures. It is like water remaining in the same place. Such waters benefit only those who live in its vicinity.

17. The River type: The river waters have a continuous flow. The *bhava* of these reciters is mobile. It also increases and decreases like the river waters.

18. The river Indus type: The waters of the Indus neither increase nor decrease. They are clear and crystal. So the love of these reciters is constant and pure.

19. The Sea type: It is represented by such devotees of God as Vyasa, Jad Bharata, Narada, Maitraya and others who are solely devoted to God and whose love for God has depth and vastness like the sea waters.
20. The Vessel water type: The quality and quantity of water in a vessel depends upon the size of the vessel and source from which water is drawn. Similarly the quality of love of this type depends upon their heart and their teachers.

(14) **Sanyas Nirnaya:** It is a work which determines the nature of renunciation, according to Vallabhacharya. He refers to the necessity of renunciation (*Tyaga*) as a means for strengthening the seed of devotion in *Bhakti vardhini.* He shows whether renunciation is possible in this iron age and if yes, who should resort to it when, how, and why? The Vedas and-the Gita have indicated action, knowledge and devotion as means for an aspirant of spiritual life. The renunciation for realisation of God should be resorted to in the path of devotion. The other two paths of Action and Knowledge are defective, if realisation of God is the goal. In support of his proposition, Vallabhacharya offers his remarks as under:—

(1) The Path of action (Karma Marga): Renunciation for the performance of the Vedic rituals is strictly prohibited by the scriptures. The Sanyasi has nothing to do with the rituals which are hindrances in his spiritual progress. The goal of the performance of the Vedic rituals is attainment of heaven, whereas the Sanyasi resorts to renunciation for salvation or realisation of God. When the Sanyasi leaves worldly life and renounces not only his family but also his property, how can he find money required for the materials for sacrificial purposes. So it should not be resorted to for performance of Vedic rites.

(2) Renunciation in the path of knowledge can be resorted to in the initial stage of the attainment of knowledge, and the latter stage of leading to salvation. This renunciation is better than the renunciation by the path of action. But here also for the initial stage, sacrifices are obligatory for the purification of mind. As for the latter stage the salvation is to be attained after many lives. Sometime the renunciation by the path of knowledge becomes a cause of repentance. The Jnani Sanyasi is forbidden from

staying at one place in any company. So Vallabhacharya does not prescribe this kind of renunciation.

(3) Renunciation by the path of devotion is of two kinds, one by nine fold devotion, and the other by pure love-devotion. Vallabhacharya does not recommend the first on the following grounds:

1. One cannot live alone but he needs company. This is against the rule that the Sanyasi should live alone.
2. He needs the *Sadhana* such as books etc, but the Sanyasi has to keep himself away from the *Sadhana.*
3. If the Sanyasi stays in one place, the occasion may arise, when he may be dragged into controversy with others. This will cause his mental distraction. At times it may fill his mind with pride of position.
4. There is fear of coming in contact with people, who are engrossed in worldly affairs.
5. He may fall a prey to sensuality.
6. It is likely that he may turn out a hypocrite.

So the path of nine fold devotion is not desirable for renunciation. The only way worth recommendation is the path of love.

Vallabhacharya states that renunciation is to be resorted to only for experiencing the state of separation from God. For that no particular dress has to be put on.

This kind of renunciation is the highest. It was practised by sage Kaundinya and the Gopis. Only absolute love for God is the means for this renunciation. One feels in this renunciation mental agonies due to separation of God. Even knowledge and the attributes of God are hindrances to him. This is hard to attain as it is realised by love only. Sensual men are unfit for it.

This path of love devotion is fearless. There is no danger of becoming a victim of sins. The possibility of sins is ruled out because the devotee is protected by God. He is so merciful as not to put hindrances in his way.

(15) Nirodha-Lakshanam: This work contains 20 verses. In this Vallabhacharya explains the necessity of *Nirodha.* In Sanyas Nirnaya he explained the real sense of renunciation to be resorted to, only for experiencing pangs of separation from God.

But merely cutting off all connection with the world and retiring into a secluded place is not enough. To achieve its purpose the discipline of *Nirodha* is necessary without which it is impossible for the devotee to engage himself in the service of God with body, heart and soul. The *Nirodha* is a kind of mental discipline which differs from that of Patanjali's discipline known by that name. Patanjali's *Nirodha* means controlling mind and its innate tendencies. This amounts to complete withdrawal or detachment from the world and is negative. But Vallabhacharya makes it a positive discipline to God. The devotee at the same time should direct his mind towards God. Detachment from the world should result into attachment to God. Detachment and attachment processes are simultaneous. As detachment increases, the force of attachment to God also increases. Withdrawing mind from the world means directing it to God. The tenth book of the Bhagavata illustrates how *Nirodha* is to be cultivated. Vallabhacharya lays utmost stress upon it as a mental discipline for the enjoyment of the bliss of the service of God and enumerates the characteristics of *Nirodha*. Gopesha explains its nature by making it a synonym of *Vyasana* condition of love.

Vallabha begins the work by desiring for misery like that suffered by Yasoda, Nanda, the Gopis and the Gopas at the separation from God when He was away from them. By this he makes clear that the *Nirodha* is nurtured in misery due to separation from God. Worldly people do not desire misery but the lover of God should desire misery so that he may think of and remember God and be near Him. In the next verse, he desires happiness like that enjoyed by the Gopis and people of Vraja at God's returning. In the third verse he expresses his ardent desire for experiencing joy of the great festival like that exnerienced at Vrindavan and Gokula at the arrival of Uddhava. Uddhava was sent by Krishna from Mathura, with a message of consolation to the people of Gokul who were unhappy on account of Krishna's absence from them. They were much delighted at the news that Uddhava was sent to them by Krishna, which implied that He did not forget them as they believed.

As an act of *Nirodha* God's eulogies should be sung or recited. They are like the dinner with butter and praises of worldly people like dry food.

God's grace will descend on those who are distressed on account of Him. Knowing their agonies, merciful God residing in the hearts of the devotees becomes visible to them. To feel the presence of God, the devotee should be God-minded. Those forsaken by God, will not betake to *Nirodha* and be happy. Our senses by their nature seek worldly pleasures. They avoid God's path. For their sanctification they should be dedicated to God. Such people on dedication will find God as merciful. Even worldly misery will be regarded as happiness by them and they borne it, due to God's Will, without grudge or protest. The devotee who has cultivated *Nirodha* will not feel jealousy towards others placed in a better position than himself, in the world. Therefore, every sense—our eyes, noses, ears, tongues, hands, feet and even the six organs and the organ of excreta have their usefulness in this path of *Nirodha* as shown in Chapter III. *Nirodha* is a sort of discipline by which mind is detached from the worldly objects and attached to God, which is necessary qualification for the fitness of God's grace through His service. By it, the body, the senses and the mind are sanctified and made divine. The devotee then has no other thought or love except for God. Though living in this world, he forgets it and knows that he lives for God, and in God, only.

(16) Seva Falam: A work on the reward of service of God is the last in this group. It embodies the essence of Pushti. It consists of 9 verses, and yet, is so important, that not less than 12 commentaries have been written on it. Primarily it aims at the account of the rewards of service but also mentions the impediments (*Pratibnadhas*) of service. The devotee who loves God selflessly with heart and soul and has taken a vow of consecration, must resort to service. This treatise mentions three rewards of service. They are: (1) *Alaukika Samarthya* (Supernatural strength) to be possessed by the devotee, so that he can win the love of God and make Him even dependent on the devotee. God being pleased with the service of His devotee puts Himself absolutely under his control. The devotee, by this, makes God sport and dance with him which is the highest reward.

(2) The second is the establishment of association with God for enjoying the *Samyoga Rasa* or joy of Union. Some understand *Sayujya* in the sense of absorption of the devotee's mind in God.

(3) Sevopayogi Deha: Getting a body useful for service of God, just as the soul of a Pushti devotee is Pushti so also his body must be of Pushti character. The commentators have offered various explanations of the word 'body'. It may be any kind of body but it must have acquired divinity by God's grace. It may be in any place Vaikuntha or Gokul—chiefly in Gokul. According to some commentators the above three rewards are of Pushti Pushti, Pushti Maryada and Pushti pravaha devotees respectively.

It should be noted here that Vallabhacharya in this work understands *Seva* in the sense of mental service.

The impediments of service are also noted here. They originate principally from (1) Anxiety (Udvega) (2) Interruption and Pleasure (Bhoga). The first is of two kinds—one due to God's will or due to interruption from worldly people or proverty etc. If it is due to the first reason, the devotee should submit to God's will. He cannot avoid it by his own power. If it is on account of the worldly people or of his own doing; it should be shunned. If it is from God, then there is no help against it. Then the devotee should think that his soul is not worthy of acceptance by God for His Grace. By knowledge and discrimination he should dispel grief from his mind.

Impediments from Pleasure are of two kinds (1) worldly and (2) Godly. The worldly pleasures are of short duration, destructive to the soul and mean. The devotee should keep himself away from them at a great distance. The pleasures due to God's Will are not to be avoided. If the impediments are due to God's will they must be welcomed as token of God's Grace.

WORKS BY SRI VITTHALESHAJI (1516-1586 A.D.)

Vidvan Mandana : Vitthaleshaji son of Vallabhacharya was an Acharya of outstanding personality with his deep erudition and original philosophical thinking. He succeeded Vallabhacharya as an Acharya. Vallabhacharya laid the foundation of Pushti Marga and Vitthaleshaji completed its edifice. He made the Pushti Marga popular. He was a scholar and a poet. He wrote many poetical compositions on the *lilas* of Krishna. His monumental work on the philosophical subject is "Vidvan Mandanam' the ornament of the learned. It is intended to give correct interpretation of the Upanishadic philosophy which was misrepresented by Shamkaracharya and his followers. Vallabhacharya's Anu Bhashya on the Brahma Sutra of Badarayana was left unfinished. Vithaleshaji completed it. There is an internal evidence to show that the Vidvan Mandana was written before his Anu Bhashya portion. The author's aim in the 'Vidvan Mandan' is to give correct exposition of the Upanishadic philosophy regarding the nature of Brahman, the world, the souls etc. and to refute Shamkarite theory of Maya (illusion). It deals with many points of school and subjects them to closest scrutiny and decides them to be unacceptable. The greatest distinguishing feature of this work is his consideration of the theory of the eternity of God's *lilas* which he asserts, receives supports from the Vedas.

Disagreeing with the philosophical teachings of the Shamkara school, he establishes the following truths with respect to God, the world and the soul, basing his ideas on Vallabhacharya's Tattva Dip Nibandha, Subodhini and the Brahma Sutras.

1. The ultimate Reality is Brahman.
2. Brahman viewed positively is qualified and viewed negatively, is non-qualified. The Shrutis have described both these aspects and even the Bhagvad Gita supports it. As qualified its form and qualities are divine, and as non-qualified it is destitute of temporal form and qualities.
3. Brahman is a material as well as the efficient cause of the world.
4. The origin of the world and the souls from Brahman is due to God's Will for sport.
5. God possesses the power (1) of manifestation (Avirbhava) and (2) disappearance (Tirobhava). When He wants to create the world, He reveals it from Him, by the first and when He wants to withdraw the world, He uses the second.
6. The world is *Sat* (being–existence) part of God and the souls are the *Chit* (consciousness) part of God.
7. Akshar Brahman is His form having, being, consciousness and finite joy. Purushottama is Supreme God. He is Perfect joy or Rasa.

8. As the world is manifested from God and by His Will, it is real.

9. There is a difference between the Jagat (world) and Samsar (worldly life-cause of bondage). The former is real and the latter unreal, and is created by the soul.

10. The world is no doubt a change from Brahman, but it is not a *Vikar.* It is only a *Parinama* (change) which is not a change in reality. There are two kinds of *Parinamas.* (1) *Vikrit* Parinama loses its original essence when it appears in the effect. The effect here cannot be restored to its original nature. (2) The *Avikrita Parinama* is that in which the effect can be restored to its original nature. The ornament is an effect of gold but it can be turned back into gold. The Samkhyas accept the *Vikrita Parinama* theory for explaining the Jagat from *Prakriti,* but Vitthaleshaji, following Vallabhacharya, rejects it and accepts the second theory that although the world, as an effect from Brahman, is a change, it does not lose its essence of Brahman. As an effect it is Brahman, and when it ceases to exist as an effect, it is Brahman. It means it is Brahman as cause and as an effect.

11. The souls are the parts (*Amshas*) of God who is an *Amshi.* The relation between them and God is that of the parts and the whole.

12. The souls are *Anu* (small) and not *Vyapaka* (pervading). They become pervading in the state of *Moksha.*

13. The soul's coming from Brahman is not production (*Utpatti*) but emergence (*Vyuchharana*) like sparks emerging from fire. They are eternal.

14. Of *Karma,* (action), *Jnana* (knowledge) and *Bhakti* (devotion), the last only is the reliable means for attainment of God.

15. The devotion is of two kinds (1) The Maryada and (2) The Pushti. The first is a means and the second is an end. The goal of the first is Moksha, that of the second is God's revelation. The first kind is called nine fold devotion and the second *Ragatmika* or love-devotion.

16. The world and the souls are non-different from Brahman who is purely non dual.
17. The attributes of God are also not different from God.
18. Brahman is immanent as well as transcendental.
19. Brahman is a substratum of the opposite kinds of qualities.
20. Maya is a power or an instrument of God by which the world is manifested for God's sport.
21. The final goal of the soul in the Pushti Marga is participation in the bliss of God in His presence. It is superior to the Moksha or losing one's individuality. The devotee of the Pushti Marga wishes to retain his individuality as the soul when in union with God, so that it can remain in the presence of God, perpetually basking in His Light and Grace and enjoying His joy in love.

The work is some what stiff but can be understood with the help of the four commentaries (1) *Suvarna Sutra* of Purushottamaji (2) *Hari Toshini* of Giradharaji (3) *Gangadharabhata's Tippani* and (4) *Siddhanta Shobha*. Sri Nanulal N. Gandhi has translated it into Gujarati. There is a handy summary of this work by Jagannatha Shastri.

Vitthaleshaji has collected in this work all the materials possible scattered here and there in different works, in order to establish his propositions on the nature of Reality of the world and the souls against the Shamkerite school. On the relation of the souls and God, there are three theories in the Shamkara School.

(1) The Limitation Theory (*Avichchhedvada*) of Vachaspati Mishra. (2) The phenomenal appearacne theory (*Abhasavada*) of Sureshvaracharya and (3) The Reflection Theory (*Pratibimbavada*) of Sarvajnatma Muni.

These three theories have been vehemently criticised and found defective by him.

(1) *Avichchhedvad*-the theory of limitation-is also called *Adhyaropavada*-the theory of Super-imposition. It means that the human soul has no separate existence. It is Brahman but Nescienece has lunated or obscured its self lumunosity and made it appear as the soul. It is Brahman Itself but is wrongly mis-

taken as the human soul due to ignorance on the part of the soul. This position of the Super-imposition school is challenged by Vitthaleshaji. He proves that the human soul is not Brahman but a part (*Amsha*) of Brahman. The nescience has nothing to do with the form of the soul. If nescience is supposed to be the cause it should be accepted as beginningless like Brahman. In that case there will be two beginningless principles, coexistent. This cuts at the very root of the Mayavada theory of Shankara, who believes in non-dualism. By opposing nescience as one, obscuring of limiting Brahman's luminousness, the exponent of the theory has to accept two principles, Brahman and Nescience, which is tantamount to the acceptance of dualism. Again, if Nescience obscures Brahman's consciousness in the soul, the soul cannot escape from the worldly bondage. The soul shall permanently remain as soul and cannot be one with Brahman, the locus of the soul. The soul is unable to free itself from Nescience.

2. The Reflection Theory: This has been examined by Vallabhacharya in his Tattva Dipa Nibandha', Part I. Vitthaleshaji also refutes this theory on the following grounds. The theory explains that the soul is a reflection of Brahman in Maya. In Vallabha's system, Maya and Avidya are different though the reflection theory has identified Maya with Avidya. The Maya enveloped Brahman is Ishvara or Personal God, and the Avidya enveloped Brahamn is the soul. The Reflection theory holds that Personal God and the soul are the reflection of Brahman into Maya and Avidya (Nescience) respectively. Vitthaleshaji proves that the claim of the Reflection school cannot stand.

1. For a reflection of any object into a mirror two obejcts—the object to be reflected and the mirror-are necessary. Here Brahman is the object and Nescience is the mirror. But it is a scientific fact that only the object having a form can have reflection. But Samkar's Brahman is formless. How can It be reflected into the Nescience?

2. The mirror in which the object is to be reflected must be pure, but nescience is by its nature impure.

3. It is also a well known fact that the object and its reflection cannot reside in one place. But according to the

Upanishadas—the two birds viz. Brahman and the soul dwell in one place.

4. If the soul is supposed to be reflection in nescience, then the soul also will be destroyed with the destruction of Nescience. The reflection will exist only so long as the mirror exists. Should this happen, how can soul realise Brahman or be one with Brahman?

3. *Abhasavada* or Appearance theory also stresses the point that it is on account of Avidya that the soul appears as such though in reality it is Brahman.

Vitthaleshaji examines this theory and finds it untenable.

1. The soul cannot be an appearance because this view is against the Shruti passage, which says that Brahman controls the soul from within.

2. If appearance is ascribed to Nescience, the question may be asked, why should it do so? Is it more powerful than Brahman, that it can make Brahman appear as the soul? Why should Brahman allow Itself to be ruled and over powered by Nescience?

   If Brahman remains impotent against Nescience, no soul will be free from worldly bondage.

Many other points have been considered by Vitthaleshaji to disprove the Appearance Theory.

He has also discussed and criticised the Naiyayika position, according to which the souls have two categories (1) as human souls limited in knowledge, and (2) as Omniscient God. The Naiyayikas accept omniscient God only. Vitthaleshaji advances the following arguments in brief to challenge the Naiyayikas.

1. If the omniscient soul (God) is believed to be the controller of the souls, then he must have some another controller and that also another. This will involve a fallacy of *Ad-Infinitum.*

2. If Ishvara of the Naiyayikas is the controller and the ruler of the souls, then he will be open to the charge of partiality and ruthlessness. Why should he make some souls happy and others unhappy, some saints and others wicked?

3. If Ishvara is believed as the maker of the world, it will give rise to the presumption that God possesses body. But the Naiyayikas do not subscribe to this view.

Brahman is the ultimate Reality which manifests itself as the souls. That Brahman is called Ishvar in his personal capacity, but He is not to be bracketed with the souls. Really speaking Ishvara is not the omniscient or Supreme Soul, but is *Brahman*, God, above all the souls and from whose consciousness the souls have been revealed.

Bhakti-Hetu-Nirnaya: This work of Vitthaleshaji with a commentary by Raghunathaji discusses the question of a cause (*hetu*) of devotion. It is of a polemical character and is a companion to *Bhakti Hansa*. Vallabhacharya is a founder of the Bhakti Marga, but his Bhakti is different from nine fold devotion, which serves as a means to the goal of Moksha. It is technically called by Vallabhacharya as the devotion of the path of Maryada which is in accordance with the scriptures. Vallabhacharya's devotion—Pushti—is higher. It is not a means but an end itself. In its Maryada stage the devotion is attended by knowledge, but when it reaches the highest step of love devotion, it is completely free from knowledge. In '*Bhakti Hansa*' Vitthaleshaji establishes supremacy of love devotion. In this work, he proves by the authorities based upon the Vedas, the Brahma Sutras, the Bhagavad Gita and the Bhagavata Purana, that the devotion does not depend upon external factors. The worldly love may depend upon physical beauty, and has much to do with the social relations of the persons, but the devotee's love for God does not depend upon the Vedic means and even on nine fold devotion. It is spontaneous. If there is any cause of the love devotion, it is to be sought in the Grace of God. The K. U. declares that God cannot be attained by sermons from the preceptors, high intelligence and deep learning but He is to be attained by the choice (*Varana*) of God. He does it, by His Will without regard to any consideraions of soul's fitness, the only consideration however, is whether the soul has dedicated itself to God, and has taken refuge in Him. Arjuna was a Maryada devotee. He is exhorted by Krishna towards the end of the Bhagavad Gita (1) that he should renounce all the means (*Dharma*) and resort to God alone by which the devotee gets immunity from sins and guarantee of protection from all evils. If surrender is taught to the devotee of the Maryada Marga it is taught with greater emphasis to the devotee of the Pushti Marga. Surrender to God does not mean the state of absolute passivity. It means that one may do his duties of life, but should put his trust in God and should believe that his duties are God's work, without attachment to fruits. The word '*Bhakti*' is derived from the root '*bhaj*' which means service 'upto' the termination which connotes the sense of love. The whole word means service of God with love. Only those who are blessed by God by His Grace, can express their love devotion through service. The proposition established here is that Pushti devotion has not any cause, except the grace of God.

WORKS BY SHRI GOKULNATHAJI (1664-1753 A.D.)

Gokulnathaji: He was the fourth son of Vithaleshji. He carried on his shoulders the mantle of his father and grandfather and devoted his whole life by oral preachings and penmanship to carry and popularise the teachings of the Pushtimarga to its followers. We shall not refer here to the two most popular works on the lives of Eighty four of Vallabhacharya's ideal disciples and of two hundred and fifty two of Vithaleshji, which are believed to have been written by him in the Vraja Bhasha, for, they are irrelevant in this section. His works in Sanskrit consist of his several commentaries on the works of Vallabhacharya. They are the commentaries on the *Sarvottam Stotra*, *Vallabhashtaka*, the *Sfurat premashtak*, the *Pushti Pravah Maryada*, the *Siddhanta Rahasyam*, the *Antahakaran Prabodha*, the *Bhaktivardhini* and the *Sanyasnirnaya*. He has written a very excellent Commentary on the *Gadya Mantra* (vow of dedication) which enjoys supreme popularity with the followers of the Pushti Marga, for, it is a successful attempt, at the correct interpretation of the holy formula. He improves upon the text of the *Gadya Mantra* by slight modification in the wording and the addition of the word '*Gopijana Vallabha* (A beloved of the Gopis) as a most appropriate epithet for Lord Krishna. The main points considered in this commentary are: (1) That *Brahmasambandha* ceremony is necessary for the followers of the Pushti Marga prior to his initiation into this path (2) That *Brahmasambandha* means reunion of the soul to God, who in His Highest form is Love (3) That the highest form of God as Love is Krishna (4) That it is an initiation ceremony to be gone through by the devotee before the image of God in the presence of a holy person–*Guru* (5) That it is to be treated as a spiritual nupital ceremony of the soul with God (6) That it is a solemn vow of dedication of the devotee to God (7) That it is a ceremony as a constant reminder of the devotee's duty unto God, which requires him to use his time and all his belongings in the service of God (8) That unless this ceremony is gone through by the disciple he cannot receive recognition as a bonafide disciple and he cannot acquire fitness for the Divine Service (9) That it teaches the lessons of self-discipline and renunciation which are absolutely necessary for the growth of the love-type devotion.

He was more of a mystic than a philosopher. The pure philosophic side does not receive his attention in his oral preachings and writings. His stress on the Love-type devotional element and aestheticism of Vithaleshaji is the distinctive feature of all his works.

WORKS BY SRI HARIRAIJI (1591-1716 A.D.)

Brahma Vada: Sri Hariraiji elucidates in this short treatise the nature of Brahman from the view point of Shuddhadvaita Philosophy. He was more of a poet than a philosopher, yet in this treatise, he describes the nature of Brahman. To him, as to Vallabhacharya, the highest concept of Brahman is that it is not only *Sat Chit Ananda* (Being, consciousness and joy) but *Rasa* (Love) also. He says that the devotee of Pushti Marga should approach Supreme Reality (Krishna) in His Love-form through love. It is this aesthetic concept of God which appears to him the most. This concept receives support from the T. U., and the *Anandmaya Adhikarana* in the first *pada* of the first chapter of the B. S. He gives two conditions of love devotion (1) of Union with God and (2) of separation from God. The second is the real way of realising God for the Pushti devotee.

In this short treatise, he considers the questions like non-difference between God and the world and the souls. He says that the world has been manifested by God for His sport. The high and low souls constitute His consciousness and they have been manifested with different names and forms along with other objects by God for His Lila. Differences in the traits of character, behaviour and tendencies of the souls are due to that.

The goals of these souls have been fixed by God's will. So some seek worldly pleasures, some heavenly happiness, through sacrifices etc., some salvation through knowledge, and some God through love. Those whose goal is the attainment of God, are souls of the highest type and are most favoured by God. These souls are Pushti souls. To see God everywhere and in all things, is the true knowledge. It is called the theory of pure Brahma because Shamkar thinks God as non dual, but he makes distinctions between God and the created things, and holds that the created things have only phenomenal existence, Brahman alone is real. Hariraiji, following Vallabhacharya, says that even created things are real. Brahman is not only non dual but its non duality is pure without any connection with Maya or Illusion. God's purpose in creation is His *lila* or sport. One should not ask why God should have such a purpose. He briefly answers that it is God's will. Thus the whole opposition against the Lila theory is silenced. All the good and the bad, beautiful and the ugly, the straight and the curved are attributed by him to the Will of God. They with their opposite characteristics also express God's qualities for His *lila*. In uniformity *lila* is not possible. There ought to be diversity which should be regarded as God's attributes. The sinners and the wicked, considered from this point, should not be condemned, since they have existence in this world due to the will of God. This work is commented by one Gopalakrishna.

Bhakti Dvaividhya Nirupanam: This is another work by Shri Hariraiji in which he treats of the dual nature of Bhakti (Devotion). He differentiates one type from other indicating its characteristics. The first kind is designated as love for the Lord's feet, and the second for His Face. The nature of the first is cold and it is to be got by the *Shravan* (hearing) and the *Kirtan*- (reciting) the praises of God. The second is very rare. Only the most fortunate devotees may have it by the Grace of God. It is to be got by contemplating the face of the Lord during the state of separation. Narada's devotion was of the first kind and that of the milk-maids of Gokula of the second kind. The same subject is treated by him in another work with a similar title. Here also he mentions two divisions of devotion. The devotion as taught in the Vedas and (2) the Devotion independent of the Vedas. In both there is love with the knowledge of God's greatness. The goal of the first is salvation and that of the second is God's love. In both, devotion should be directed to the service of God. In the first kind that service is practical, through body etc., and in the second it is mental. In the first, there is no specification of love. Any kind of love accompanied by the knowledge of God's greatness as the creator is needed but in the second kind the love specified as God's love, is to be attained by the devotee by the love like that of a woman. The devotee should renounce the world, discard all earthly loves, and make God his object of love. This devotion is an end to be achieved. He lives in the world, but he is so much detached from the world, that he is not conscious of any of his association with the world. He forgets this world knowing that he belongs to God only. Thus though in the world he lives in God only.

Mukti Dvaividhya Nirupana: In this work he deals with the dual aspects of *Moksha* (Salvation). Hariraiji following Vallabhacharya, does not understand the term Moksha in the sense of absorption of the soul into Brahman. To him it means union with God. Its two types are termed as (1) Attainable by the soul through means (2) Bestowed on the soul by God by His Grace. In the first kind, the soul enters God. In the second God enters the soul. The first is attained gradually, and is known as *Krama Mukti* or *Sayujya*. In the second there is no gradualness. God Himself comes to the soul and blesses it with His grace. There is no expectation and reward. It is God who acts for the salvation of the soul. This is called *Sadyomukti*.

Antaranga Bahiranga Prapancha Viveka:

(Discrimination between the inner and the outer world)

In this work, Hariraiji discriminates the Inner World, from the Outer one. The world that we experience with our senses is the outer world, and should be shunned. The differences are explained as under:

	Inner World		Outer World
1	It is the world without any differences, and exists for God alone.	1	It is in the form of the world, the souls and the Antaryamin.
2	It is *Anandamaya*—full of joy.	2	The joy is concealed in it. It appears as 'being' and 'consciousness' without joy.
3	Purushottama is its material cause.	3	Akshara is its material cause.
4	It is Avikrit—changeless, eternal and immutable.	4	It is changing and mutable.
5	Maya has nothing to do with it.	5	It is associated with Maya as an instrument or power of God by which it has been created.
6	In it God reveals His form in obedience of the devotee's Will to make Him participate in His joy.	6	This is created by God's Will for His sport.
7	In this the devotee desires God's love and the bliss from it in the presence of God.	7	In this, the soul seeks the pleasures of the senses.

SharanDvayaNirupan: In this work, Hariraiji determines that *Sharan* (Surrender) has two forms (1) known as *Siddha Sharan* and (2) *Sadhana Sharan*—first is for the Pushti devotee and the second for the Maryada devotee. The first is to be had by renunciation, the second by non-renunciation. The first is independent of means such as knowledge and even remembering the *gunas* or attributes of God which are destructive in this surrender. It is secured only by God's grace. The first kind of surrender is intended for experiencing the pangs of separation from God. The second is dependent upon the means.

WORKS BY SHRI VRAJARAIJI

Brahmavada : It is an independent short treatise, attempting to explain the Shuddhadvaita concept of Brahman.Its ideals are principally drawn from the Vidvan Mandana. It is of polemical nature seeking to refute the Shamkaracharya's Mayavada. It starts with the statement that Brahman is one though it is described in the Shrutis as qualified and non qualified. Both these asepcts represent Brahman's Reality.

Shankaracharya relies only upon the negative Shrutis which assert that Brahman is non-qualified. The qualified form is due to Maya and it is intended only for the purification of the mind through worship in the initial stages. Brahman is in reality non-qualified but this aspect of Brahman is incomprehensible and inaccessible to the souls in the worldly stage till they are purified and acquire fitness for the knowledge God. The worship of the qualified Brahman is taught by the Upanishadas. Shamkara thus makes distinctions between the qualified Brahman and the non-qualified one and holds that the non-qualified Brahman is the principal and the qualified one is secondary.

The author of this work asserts that it is against the teaching of the Shrutis. The Upanishad passages describe both the forms of Brahman as of equal importance, which only describe Brahman positively and negatively. The qualified form of Brahman is the positive way of describing Brahman that Its form and attributes are real, because they are divine. The negative way implies that Brahman does not possess the worldly attributes. The purpose of the negative Shrutis is to deny the worldly attributes of Brahman. The Shruti that 'All this is indeed Brahman' explicitly asserts that the world is Brahman. Brahman's being qualified and non qualified is expressed in the passage. "It is handless and footless and yet it grasps the things and runs". This is possible only if the forms and attributes of God are supposed as Divine and not as worldly. The Upanishadas describe both these forms positively and negatively in order to leave no doubt in understanding the real nature of Brahman. Looked both ways, both these forms are real and they are of one Reality.

The Shamkara school resorts to *Shakha Arundhati Nyaya* for explaining the two kinds of forms. One who wants to see a star called *Arundhati* which is extremely tiny from a distance at first sight, he cannot see it, but his guide asks him first of all to turn his eyes towards a particular branch of a tree and then look straight towards the sky with perfect attention till the tiny star becomes visible. In the same way the aspirant should first resort to qualified Brahman and then he will be able to realise the nature of non-qualified Brahman. Then it is not necessary to take the help of the tree. One naturally looks up at the sky and sees the star. In the same way, the aim of the aspirant being Non-qualified Brahman, he has to resort to qualified Brahan in the preliminary stage, but after the knowledge of non-qualified Brahman is attained, the worship of qualified Brahman is not needed. The non-qualified Brahman in that stage is reached directly. To this Vrajraiaji replies that this illustration does not prove the position of the Shankara School. According to the illustration, both the branch of a tree, and the star aimed at are concrete and visible things, but non qualified Brahman—the ultimate aim is non-visible and the qualified one is visible according to their belief.

Shamkara's theory of two Brahmans is exploded on the following grounds:

1. It is contradictory to the Shrutis, which declare unequivocally Brahman's being one and non-dual.
2. If two Brahmans are accepted it will be Dualism which contradicts his non-dualism.
3. If it is said that the qualified Brahman is different from the non qualified Brahman, it is also false, for, Shamkaracharya holds that Brahman is one and all things are Brahman, and the qualified Brahman is also not different from Brahman.
4. If it is held that the qualified Brahman is due to nescience (*Upadhi*) then nescience being beginningless (*Anadi*) like Brahman, the creativeness of Brahman will be of a permanent nature and there will be no end to it. To say that the qualified Brahman is the product of Maya does not hold good as it forces us to suppose Maya as the cause. So, it must be either *Samavayi* (material) or *Asamavayi*, or *Nimitta* (accidental) cause. It cannot be

the first because qualified Brahman is not quality of *Maya.* It cannot be second as then it must be a quality of non-qualified Brahman which is the material cause like the jarness in jar. It cannot be an efficient cause like the wheel etc. in the production of a jar. The wheel etc. are used by the potter. The creativeness of the world belongs to the qualified Brahman. If the Maya is a *Nimitta Karana* (accidental cause), it must be an instrument of the qualified Brahman, and not itself an Agent, using Qualified Brahman as an efficient cause.

If it is held that the partless Brahman is obscured by Maya and appears as qualified this is also wrong. Brahman according to Shamkara is partless. So how can one that is partless, appear as having parts i.e. qualities?

Shamkara's illustration of the jar-sky is not appropriate to explain the qualified Brahman, being due to Upadhi or nescience. The sky (space) is limitless but in the jar it is limited as jar-sky (space). In this example it is not wrong to describe the jar-sky as a part of the great sky because one beholds the space limited in the jar, but in the case of the qualified Brahman one has no cognition like that.

Vrajaraiji further proves that Maya has nothing to do with Brahman. There is no connection between Brahman and Maya. It can neither be *Samyoga* (connection by contact) nor by *Sayujya* (inherence). If it is *Samyoga,* then Brahman and Maya must be two separate realities. But it is not said so in the Upanishadas. Brahman is abstract and Maya is only negative. The Samavaya connection is also not possible because Maya is not an attribute or a part of Brahman.

He then examines the Naiyayika Theory of the non-existence of an effect in the cause. On the supposition of this theory, this school believes that the world as an effect did not exist in the cause. Vrajaraji following Vitthaleshaji proves this view as untenable. As world is revealed out of Brahman, it had existence in the cause prior to its separate manifestation. Existence or being like consciousness is a constituent part of Brahman, which is revealed by God's Will in the form of the world.

The Naiyayikas hold that before the clay assumed the form of a jar the jar did not exist in the prior state i.e. the clay state (*Pragavstha*) and after the destruction of the jar, it shall have no existence (*Pradhvansavastha*). Again when we say that jar is not cloth, it means the jar has no existence in cloth (Anoynyabhava) and when we say that this is not a jar, its existence is completely denied (Atyantabhava). In all these examples the jar as an effect has not existence in any of the above four cases of non-existence. On the strength of this argument, the Naiyayikas hold that the world as an effect is non-existent.

Vrajaraiji on the strength of the Sruti passage says that the existence of the world as an effect is supported by the Upanishadas. If the world has no existence, how can it be experienced by us. It is the experience of all men that the world exists for them. It is not like the dream-world. The world before its separate existence did exist in Brahman, and will have its existence in Brahman after its destruction. All the objects like the jar, etc. have existence in all the conditions. Only their forms change. Each object is revealed by God from Him, endowed with a certain *dharma* or attribute. The object jar reveals the attribute jarness which is explicit in the jar but implicit in the cloth. The vairous objects with names and forms reveal God's particular attributes, predominantly latent in other objects. The truth is that these attributes exist in the objects by their potency and latency, which are characterised as God's powers of *Avirbhava* and *Tirobhava*. So existence of a thing means potency of a particular attribute in that thing, and non-existence means latency of the attribute, but not its non-existence. Shuddhadvaita school does not accept the theory of non-existence.

In conclusion, Vrajaraiji establishes that Brahman is one. It has, however, three forms, the physical as the world, and the souls as the spiritual—Akshara and as the Divine, Purushottama. Purushottama is the highest form and is attainable only by love devotion. Akshara Brahman is an abode of Purushottama and is attainable by knowledge.

WORKS BY SHRI GIRIDHARAJI

Suddhadvaita Martanda:

He is a learned author of the commentary known as Vivarana on Anu Bhashya. It is said that he was the first scholar to designate Vallabha's Bhashya as Anu Bhashya. Vallabhacharya himself did not give it this name, nor his son Vitthaleshaji, who completed the latter portion of the Bhashya. He is also credited to distinguish Vallabhacharya's philosophy, from other schools of philosophy by naming it as Shuddhadvaita Philosophy. There is no evidence from the literature of this school to show that the word Shuddhadvaita was current before Girdharaji. It was then known as Brahmavada as against the Maya Vada of Shamkara, but as other schools of philosophy had received distinct names as Kevaladvaita of Shamkar, Vishishtadvaita of Ramanuja, Dvaitadvaita of Nimbaraka and Bhaskara and the Dvaita of Madhva, he perhaps thought it proper to give some appropriate name to Vallabhacharya's philosophy. In his judgment the name Shuddhadvaita was quite appropriate. The whole work consists of 95 Karikas (verses), like Vallabhacharya's Tattva Dipa Nibandha—Shastrartha Prakaran. It is an independent attempt to state the fundamental principles of the Shuddhadvaita Philosophy. Ramakrishna Bhatta has elucidated it by his commentary called Prakasha.

The title of the work, means 'The sun of the Shuddhadvaita Philosophy'. At the close of the work he explains why this work is entitled as the Sun. Just as at the rising of the sun, cold and fuggy atmosphere disappear, the roads become distinctly clear, the lotuses bloom and sparkle in the lakes, the veil of darkness is lifted from the surface of the earth, creatures breathe the spirit of freedom and joy in their various activities, so, by the knowledge of this work, the ignorance will be removed, the hearts of the devotees will be warmed by love of God, and they will feel freedom from the world and experience ecstasy of the service of God and enjoy His love.

In the beginning, he explains the word Shuddhadvaita which is a compound of two words 'Shuddha' (pure) and 'Advaita' (non-dualism). Advaita is the opposite of Dvaita which is derived from

'Dvaita' meaning a collection of two i.e. matter (world) and the souls. Dvaita means Dualism. The 'A' before 'Dvaita' expresses the negative sense i.e. non-dualism, while Shuddhadvaita means a philosophy of pure non dualism. By dualism it is intended to include the differentiation of a cause and effect, the unconscious and the conscious. All these differences are for God's sport. Shankara explains these differences due to Maya and asserts that Brahman alone is non-dual and real, but the differences of matter and the souls are unreal. His philosophy is therefore, known as only non-Dualism. The differences are simply appearances and not real, the only Reality being Brahman. Vallabhacharya does not accept Shankar's Maya theory. God's creative activity is not due to Maya but to His pure Will, and again, creation is not production, it is manifestation of God's form, as Being and consciousness. By His will God manifests the world and the souls, and by His Will He takes them back into Him. It is His Will which plays the important role. No doubt God makes use of his Maya which is nothing but his power, while creating but the creative activity is not to be attributed to Maya as understood by Shankara. The differences of the unconscious and the conscious are manifestation of God's own constituents differentiated for His play. Even as differences they reveal God's form, so they are one with God. God as cause and effect, or as the world and the souls, or under different names and forms retains His purity of Divine Nature. It is neither diminished nor obscured by Maya as supposed by Shankaracharya. For this reason, the word 'pure' is introduced before Advaita to explain the correct meaning of Vallabha's philosophy.

Having thus explained the name of the Shuddhadvaita Philosophy, he explains the nature of Brahman which is omnipotent, omnipresent, omniscient, the maker of all things, possessor of all powers, and having—Being, consciousness and joy as Its form. Next he enumerates the characteristics of the soul as possessed of conseiousness, infinitesimally small and a part (Amsha) of the God, with joy latent in it. The purpose of God's creation is indicated in verse 12, which is for the sport (Krida) and is explained that just as a serpent assumess straight or circular form as it wills, in the same way, God also assumes any form according to

His Will. Although so many forms issue from God, the essential nature of God, remains unaffected, just as gold, changed into ornaments, remains as gold in essence, all the objects express the divinity of God who is the controller of Prakriti (the world) and the Purushas (souls). All the case relations in grammar refer to God. In the nominative case, God is the subject or enjoyer, in the accusitive an object, or the enjoyable, in the instrumental case as an instrument by which actions are performed, in the dative as the persons or objects with reference to whom particular actions are done or something is given, in the ablative case as the persons or places from which something is separated, and in the locative as place, the persons, objects or places, in which other things are located. The whole language transaction by case relationships points to the presence of God. Thus establishing the oneness of Brahman, he criticises Shankaracharya's explanation of '*Tat Tvam Asi*'—Thou art That.' 'That' (Tat) means Brahman and 'thou' (Tvam) the human soul. Shankara says that this sentence in the C.U. conveys the sense of identification between the human soul and Brahman. Girdharaji, following Vallabhacharya says that the interpretation is wrong. It does not imply the sense of identification, but of likeness between the soul and Brahman. The word '*Tatvam*' in the sentence should be taken as one word, and not as two words 'Tat' and 'Tvam'. 'Tvam' does not mean Thou. It is an affix added to '*Tat*' in the abstract sense of condition, meaning the condition of being like That (*tat*) Brahman. The relation between the soul and Brahman is that of an Amsha 'part' and the 'Amshin' the whole. The latter portion criticises Shankara's Mayavada, Ramanuja's Vishishtadvaita, Bhaskara and Nimbarka's Dvaita-Dvaita, Madhva's Dvaita and Shakti Vada. All the above Vadas showing relation between the world and souls on one hand, and God on the other, are proved defective in one way or another. They have no support from the Vedas, so are not acceptable.

He then considers Akshara in relation to Purushottama and says that Purushottama is the Supreme Reality or Ultimate Principle, which can be attained only by devotion. The final goal of a devotee is not Moksha (salvation) but *Parmananda Prapti* (attainment of Divine Joy).

WORKS BY SHRI PURUSHOTTAMAJI

Khyati Vada: It is a polemical work criticising the various theories on Error in Indian Philosphical systems and finds them not satisfactory. The theories of error are dealt with at length in the previous Chapter II.

Moreover Vallabhacharya has attempted an explanation of error in his *Subodhini* commentary on the Bhagavata BK. II. Shri Purushottamaji elucidates it in this work. According to him, the error is to be explained in two ways, one by the *Akhyati* which holds that in fact there is no wrong perception of the object. The wrong perception arises out of the *Samskara* of the memory image of the object existig in the mind, which is wrongly directed by the *Tamas*-bewildering attribute of the intellect or by the *Anya Khyati* of the Purva Mimansa. The first one is resorted to by Perfect souls who have acquired perfect knowledge and perfect control over their minds, the second way is resorted to others who are imperfect in knowledge and self-discipline.

Shri Purushottamaji criticises the various theories and assigns reasons for their rejection. The wrong perception is due to wrong interpretation of the object by intellect under the influence of the predominance of *Tamas* or bewildering quality. It may be called the *Buddhi* creation. But ultimately, the erring of Tamas quality in the intellect of the soul is due to God's will for His *lila* (sport). Considered from this view, the error as such has no separate existence from God. It is due to God's will that the attribute of the shell is manifested in silver, and obscured in the shell. So this wrong perception is nothing but the perception of the manifested quality, for the time being in silver and non-perception of it in shell, because God does obscure it at that time. So ultimately the visibility, and non visibility are to be accounted by God's powers of manifestation and non-manifestation. No doubt as stated above, the effect of *Tamas*, the presence of the *Samsakaras* and of the attributes common to shell and silver explain the possibility of the wrong perception, but really it is the work of God's Will which is expressed in hide and seek play.

BhedabhedaSvarupaVada is the theory that discusses the nature of difference and non-difference between the world and the souls on the one hand, and Brahman on the other. There have been various theories on this question. Shankar's theory is called '*Abheda*' Non-difference theory, meaning thereby Brahman alone is real. He says the differences, being due to illusion or nescience are not real. Ramanuja also holds the Abhedavada, but he says that the differences are to be regarded as adjectives of the substance. The adjective 'white' in white cow is invariably associated with a cow. In the same way, 'the *chit* and the *Achit*' the conscious and unconscious are invariably associated. So, although seeming, differences are not real, their relation to Brahman is like that of the body to the soul. Bhaskara and Nimbarka hold the brief for Bhedabheda—one holding differences of *chit* and *achit* unreal and Brahman real. To Madhva, differences are a reality. Vallabha advocates Shuddha Abheda, meaning there is pure non-difference and as such the differences are also real. The Upanishadic texts corroborate both difference and non-difference. The Shruti 'I am one', 'I wish to be Many', supports difference. The Shruti '*Ekam Eva Advitiyam.*' 'It is only one—Non-dual' emphasises Nondifferences. These two opposite Shrutis have created confusion in the minds of some, in comprehending the relation between the differentiated things and Brahman. Vallabha has stated his position as above, but still some doubt lurks in the minds of some critics that the fact, that the differentiated things have separate existence, cannot be denied. Even the objects like jar etc. have physical existence and they seem to be different from Brahman. So differences have to be accepted just for their satisfaction. Purushottamaji reconciles both the views of the difference and of non-difference. But he says that what is cognised as difference is not separate but inherent in non-difference. Brahman by its Will has differentiated Itself into many forms. So the differentiated forms are not different from Brahman, as cognition of difference is only superficial and only apparent. This is ealled *Bheda Sahishnu Abheda.* This is resorted to for explaining the differences in our dealings in the world. Without differences our life cannot go on. This is only for practical purposes but theoretically and fundamentally there is non-difference.

Srishtibheda Vada: In this work, Purushottamaji examines the various theories relating to creation and proves them as fallacious. His object is to prove with the support of the passages from the Upanishadas, that world is created by God out of Him who is the material and also efficient cause. First of all the author criticises the *Asat Karya Vada* (The theory of Non-existence of an effect) of the Naiyayikas, the atomic theory, known also as *Arambhavada* of the Vaisheshikas, the Samkhya theory of the causality of Prakriti, the illusion theory of Shankara, and the Parinama Vada of the Puruvamimansa.

The Naiyayikas believe that the world as an effect, did not exist in the cause. It is a new production. This is refuted on the following grounds:

1. If the world as an effect did not pre—exist in the cause then it is a mere nonentity like the sky flower.
2. If the effect did not pre-exist in the cause anything can be produced from anything. The curd should be produced out of water and oil out of sand particles.
3. If the jar is not present in clay, or oil in oilseeds, no body, however, clever and intelligent, can produce a jar from clay and oil from oil seeds. This means that the effect is implicit in its material cause.

The effect comes out from its cause, in which it was implicit before it became explicit as an effect. In all cases of effects, this rule holds good. Nothing comes out from nothing. Every object which has existence has emerged, from the cause in which it existed as being one with it. In the case of a cloth although it is not seen separately as existing in threads, it becomes visible when these threads are combined together and woven. So, the emerging of an effect from a cause, sometimes needs combination of these materials. Had the threads been not combined, the cloth would not have appeared. Again how is it that from the threads, we have a cloth and not a jar? The reason is quite simple, that the threads or cotton possess the potentiality of being manifested as a cloth. The Naiyayika theory of non-existence of the effect cannot stand to logical test.

Refutation of the atomic theory of the Vasisheshika School

Next, the author criticises theory of the causality of *anus* or atoms. It is not only peculiar to *Kanada* but is the distinguishing feature of his philosophy. Vallabha has refuted this theory in his Anu Bhashya. (1) Since atoms have no space, their combination is impossible. (2) They are not eternal. (3) If atoms are external, there will be no dissolution of the universe. (4) We cannot suppose that atoms possess form. If we believe that they possess form, they would be ephemeral. (5) This atomic theory is not accepted by all Vaidikas. Purushottamaji also opposes this theory as under:

(1) The Vaisheshikas believe the atom to be physical in character, but this is not correct because the elements or *bhutas* namely earth, fire etc. did not exist before an atom. If it is said that the sky did exist, the answer is that even the mind also did exist. So the position of the Vaisheshikas is not correct.

(2) The theory cannot be accepted on the ground of perception because when a man dies his body, the outcome of the atoms of earth, water etc., must not be seen, because just as the outcome of the body is the combination of the atoms so death must be the dissolution of the atoms. In this process, the body of the dead man must not exist.

(3) It states that the effect is non-existent in the cause. This is refuted above.

The Samkhya theory of the causality of Prakriti is also challenged. That school attributes creation to Prakriti. It relies upon the following in support of the theory.

1. The Shruti *Pradhant Jagat Jayati* declares that the world is produced from Pradhana Prakriti.
2. Wherever Brahman is said to be the cause of creation, Brahman should be understood in the sense of Prakriti.
3. S.U. 4-5 mentions that *Aja* unborn or Prakriti is the cause of creation. The Samkhya school believes that their theory of the causality is based upon the Upanishadas, but the BrahmaSutrakara has disproved that. Shamkara, Ramanuja and Vallabha have in their commentaries proved that the Samkhya view is not correct. Purushottamaji bases his arguments on Vallabha's Anu Bhasshya and Vitthaleshaji's Vidvan Mandana. He says that the Samkhya theory is untenable. Prakriti being *Jada* (unconscious) cannot create, as creative activity be-

longs to consciousness. Prakriti is not an independent Reality. It represents the being aspect of God. The word *Aja* used in the Shruti passage is to be understood in the sense of God's Power..There is not a single passage in the Upanishadas, which will directly support the Samkhya theory, though the specific words like Prakriti, Purusha, Mahat. Ahamkara, etc. current in the Sam khya system are found there. Rightly understood, they go to establish the causality of Brahman.

The Parinama Vada is rejected by the author. If the effect is considered as a change it will go against the *Sat—Karya Vada* (The change theory of the samkhya) of the Samkhyas who believe in the reality of the effect also. The Samkhyas accept Prakriti and Purusha as ultimate principles, and as eternal .If it is so, how is it that the Prakriti becomes subject to modification and the Purusha remains unmodified?

Next Mayavada (Theory of Illusion) of Shankaracharya is made a target of attack. This theory ascribes the causality of the world by Brahman due to *Maya* or *Avidya* (Illusion or Nescience) and holds that the world has no existence. Its appearance as such is phenomenal. Purushottamaji's arguments in refuting this theory, are based upon Anu Bhashya, Tattva Dipa Nibandha and Subodhini by Vallabhacharya and V.M. of Vitthaleshaji. Following Vallabhacharya, he enumerates five kinds of creations as shown in Chap. II, Section I.

These different kinds of creation are supported by him, with quotations from the Upanishadas, the Gita and the Puranas—particularly the Bhagavata. He also states that the Maya principle of Shankara does not occur in the Upanishadas. It is however found in the Puranas but there its purpose is to detach men from the worldly pleasures. Vallabhacharya understands by it the Power or Energy of God inherent in Him. God uses it for the purpose of creation. In this sense it is an instrument of God for the purpose of creation. Shankara has been influeneced by the Ajatvad of Gauda Pad Acharya in his commentary on the Mandukya Upanishad; but Gaudpada did not understand the M.U. in the right spirit.

Having discussed all these theories, Purushottamaji arrives at the conclusion that the world is God's own creation. It emerges from God by His own Will. It is not a product but a manifestation of God. It represents the Existence aspect of God and as such it is a form of Brahman. Its reality is not diminished in being separated from Brahman. Brahman is existence, consciousness and joy where as the world is only existence patent, with consciousness latent in it.

Andhakara Vada: It is the theory discussing the nature of darkness or *Tamas* whether it exists as a separate substance or as non-existence of light. Some schools accept it as a substance. Purushottamaji discusses the various views and comes to the conclusion that it is not a substance. The Vaishesihka School has mentioned nine substances five elements, space, time, spirit, and mind. *Tamas* cannot be included in the seven categories of the Vaisheshikas namely substance, quality, action, universality, particularity and inherence. It is not universality, as it has not got any common property with other objects like cowness in all the cows, nor is it a particularity because it does not possess a differential mark by which it can be individualised. It is only the negation of light. It is not inherence, because, no cause and effect or the whole and part relations subsist in it. If it is a substance, then it must be a substratam of some qualities. It is not. It cannot be identified with quality because if it were a quality it must inhere in some substance but darkness does not inhere in any substance. It is not an action, because it cannot produce contact. It cannot be earth, having no smell, not air having no touch, not light, having no lustre. Similarly it cannot be associated with space, time, spirit or mind. So those who accept it, say that it is different from the nine substances. The followers of Kanada do not take it as a separate substance. Purushottamaji replies that the idea is opposed to the view of Badarayana and Jaimini. Kanada's definition of *Tamas* as absence of existence is wrong. It is also wrong to know it as an error. The followers of Prabhakara regard *Tamas* as absence of the knowledge of light. He says that the absence of light is called *Tamas*, but this is not correct. The knowledge of the absence of knowledge is only a mental act and not a physical one. In the opinion of the author, it is a product of Maya which is the original power of God whose function is obscuring other things. It is a veil which covers up the things and prevents them from being seen. It cannot be included in the list of the substance, though it exists as a product of Maya.

Prasthan-Ratnakara: This work of Purushottamaji is too rigid and difficult to be summarised. It is purely a philosophical work. It is incomplete, only available in two Parichhcedas. The main problem is the Reality, treated from the stand point of Vallabhacharya's Shuddhadvaita philosophy. It is treated epistemologically and ontologically in a *Pramana* and a *Prameya* way. Under the first are discussed the theories of the *Pramanas* for knowledge accepted by the other schools, and the author's own view is expressed. He divides knowledge into two parts (1) known as *Satya Jnana* or *Bhavajnan,* which is indicated in the Shruti, which describes Brahman as Truth, knowledge and Infinite. According to this, Brahman is self luminous. Knowledge is Its very nature or essence revealed in God's qualities, just as the light of the sun is revealed in the rays .This knowledge is further collected and conserved in the Vedas like the light of the sun on the earth revealed through the word-form of God. These four kinds of knowledge of *Svarupa, Guja,* the Vedas and the word are like the light of the Sun's Disc of the rays that spread on the earth, and the light in reflections. This knowledge is intrinsic. The other kind of knowledge is to be got through five organs of knowledge and the four internal elements, the mind, the intellect, the ego and the consciousness. This knowledge is obtained by the soul, with reference to the world which is knowable. By means of knowledge, the knower i.e. soul should know that the world is the form of God and real. Thus Purushottamaji explains that knowledge is ten fold—four fold due to God's nature, five fold due to the organs of senses and four external elements and one with reference to the world. The knowledge due to God's nature is self-luminous. It comes as the Grace of God. For the knowledge by the organs etc. one has to get it by the study of the scriptures, contact with the learned and saintly persons, by hearing and by self-control. He includes all knowledge under three categories (1) Knowledge whose locus is God (*Bhagavadashraya*) as revealed in God's nature, His qualities, the Vedas, and word form. This is of four kinds. (2) the knowledge whose locus is the soul, as a knower, got by his external organs and four internal organs—the mind, the intellect, the ego and the consciousness. It is of five kinds. (3) The knowledge whose locus is the world. It is of one kind. The world is an object of knowledge. By knowledge the subject (the soul—the knower) knows the object that it is the form of God. By the *Bhagavadashraya* knowledge, he knows only God and neither the soul nor the world. The knowledge of the first kind is relating to the cause, and that of the second is relating to the effect—the world. The four fold knowledge of the first kind is revealed in the soul as the quality of the Atman, the six fold knowledge of the second kind about the world is obtained by the soul through external organs of knowledge including the mind, the intellect, the ego and the consciousness. The first kind of knowledge is immutable, the second mutable. It is not monetary or evanescent, but steady in the emperical state of the world and therefore real. The test of the continuity and steadiness of knowledge lies in the remembrance of God. The object of knowledge is to preserve the impressions about God in memory for a long period in the worldly state. If these impressions are lost for want of continuity of knowledge the memory of God also will be lost. So the process of acquiring knowledge must be continuous. Our organs receive impressions about God by knowing that the world is the existence part of God and our internal organs should preserve those impressions by contemplation of God.

The knowledge which the soul seeks from the worldly objects through the organs, is worldly knowledge and is of three kinds—according to the influence and predominence of the three gunas, the Sattva, the Rajas and the Tamas. The Sattvika knowledge is the best, reliable and worth seeking, the Rajas, as lower than that, is less trustworthy. The Tamas is the lowest and must be shunned by an aspirant of spiritual life. The Sattvika knowledge is called *Nirvikalpa*—the knowledge of oneness of Brahman without differences. The Rajasa is called *Savikalpa*—the knowledge which involves oneness of Brahman and the differences of the world and the souls, the Tamas knowledge consists only in knowing the differences of the world and the souls. The Mimansakas, the Bauddhas, and the Naiyayikas also have the two divisions of knowledge but their meanings differ. According to the Naiyayikas, the knowledge which one gets from the contact of the senses with external objects, without any determination is called Indeterminate knowledge but when one knows the exact nature of the object, it is Determinate. Mimansakas believe that when the nature of the object is determined by five factors (1) common property (2) substance (3) quality (4) action and (5) a name, it is called Determinate. When the knowledge has no reference to these it is Indeterminate. According to the Vijnanvadi Baudhas, the knowledge of consciousness as Reality alone is non-determinate and the knowledge of the world and the souls is determinate. The Mayavadin makes the real distinction between the two, by saying that knowledge arising out of contact with the objects is Determinate, and the knowledge not arising out of the contact is Indeterminate. The knowledge of non-duality of Brahman is indeterminate and of the duality of the world and the souls is determinate. The Shuddhadvaita holds that when God is known in His absolute oneness without differences in His Existence, it is Indeterminate or the Sattvik knowledge, but when God is known with differences of the names and forms in the world, it is Determinate. The determinate knowledge according to Purushottamaji has five varieties (1) doubt (2) contrarity (3) Determination (4) memory (5) sleep. The knowledge got through intellect is superior to the knowledge got through mind. Even here the knowledge obtained by the Sattvika intellect alone is trustworthy as teaching the determination of the nature of the object of knowledge. This is rightly understood as *Prama*-knowledge. It is of dual character. (1) perceptual and (2) non-perceptual. The proof which leads to the right knowledge is called Pramana. The knowledge due to Shabda Brahma is principle, and that got by perception inference etc. is subsidiary. The Shuddhadvaita school accepts only the *Shruti*, *Pratyaksha*, *Smriti* and *Anumana* as *Pramanas*. Others are accepted if they support these.

Of all these proofs in the matter of the knowledge of God, the Word—Testimony is accepted as trustworthy, other scriptures are accepted if only they support the above. Of the above scriptures, the succeeding one is of greater value than the preceding one. Thus the Bhagavata has the highest value.

This view is based upon Vallabha's statement in the T.D.N.

The second part relates to the Prameya—the knowledge of Reality. It is triple (1) as original (2) as a cause and (3) as an effect.

The original Reality is known as Akshara in whom Prakriti and Purusha are inherent in unmanifest condition. It is also known as *Kutastha, Avyakta, Sadasat.* It is experienced in three forms of time, work and nature. The work-form is revealed in all the activities of obligatory or prohibited, either in the scriptures or in the worldly dealings. The Akshara as Time, appears in the sense of time division, the work, as the space, and the nature in the changes; i.e. Time, space and all the changes, are manifested from Akshara Brahman as a cause *is* the source of all 28 elements shown in Chap. II. The world constitutes the existence or unconscious aspect of Brahman, and the souls the conscious aspect of Brahman. Having stated these three forms of Brahman, Purushottamaji, summarises his view that all these forms of God are real. The Highest form of God which is higher than Akshara is Purushottama. As Purushottama, He is both qualified, in the sense that His form and qualities are divine, and non qualified in the sense that they are not worldly. Purushottama is Perfect Joy. The world and the soul-forms are to be looked upon as manifestations and not as changes or the *Vikaras* as they are not different from Brahman.

Jiva Pratibimbatva Khandan Vada: The work on the refutation of the theory of the human soul as a reflection of God is chiefly of polemical character. The author examines the claims of the Mayavadins, who assert that the human soul is a reflection of Brahman, due to Maya or illusion or Avidya. Here the author states that among the sponsors of the reflection theory, there are following six views:

1. The reflection of consciousness in Maya is called Ishvara —personal God, and that in the Avidya (nescience) is called human soul.
2. The reflection in the Prakriti, having predominance of the Sattva quality is Ishvara and that in the Prakriti having predominance of the Tamas is Jiva.
3. The Reflection of Brahman in the Prakriti with the projecting power of Maya is Ishvara, and that in the Avidya with the concealing Power is the Jiva.
4. The reflection in Avidya is God and that in the inner organ is the Jiva.

5. The reflection of Maya resorting to Brahman in the intellect producing differences is God and that of the Maya associated with the body of every individual in the internal organ is called Jiva.
6. The reflection of the consciousness of Brahman in the mind is God and that in the nescience is soul.

Purushottamaji discussed them in his commentary on Vallabhacharya's Tattva Dipa Nibandha.

The main arguments used by him for rejecting the Reflection theory are as shown in this chapter although elsewhere they have been given again in his another work with the same title.

In addition to the arguments given in Chapter II he adds that—

1. The Gita holds the soul is a fragment of Brahman. It does not describe it as a reflection of Brahman.
2. If the Jiva is regarded as reflection, there will be no Moksha, because the sponsors of the reflection theory hold that the reflection of Brahman in Nescience is Jiva, but the nescience is destroyed by Knowledge so when knowledge destroys nescience, it also destroys the reflection in it, called the Jiva.

On such grounds, the reflection theory is challenged by him. On the authorities of the Shruti passages, the Brahma Sutras, and the Gita he asserts that the Jiva is not a reflection and unreal but is the Amsha (fragment) of God as being and consciousness, and it is real.

Bhaktyutkarshavada: In this small work, Shri Purushottamaji establishes superiority of devotion over knowledge. This controversial point centres mainly on the text of the Maitreyi Brahmana, which says that when the desires are destroyed a mortal becomes immortal and attains Brahman. As regards this text, a querry is put in the beginning as to how to become immortal. The reply is, 'The Atman should be seen, heard, thought and contemplated. The sponsor of the knowledge theory asserts that the Atma Darshana i.e. realisation of the self is indicated as a way to immortality. In other words he supposes that knowledge is a means to immortality. According to the above Shruti, Purushottamaji, commenting upon the purport says that interpreting it in favour of the knowledge doctrine betrays ignorance of the context. The word, 'Atman' in, 'Atma Darshana' is not to be understood in the sense of human soul but for God. So the word *Atma Darshana* means the seeing of God. The Upanishadas use Atman in the sense of God. The meaning of the Shruti is, 'God should be seen, heard, thought and contemplated.' But how is God to be seen? The Shruti further says that by making God as an object of love, he can be seen. It implies that God should be loved above all others and loves including love to family, to society, to country etc. should be regarded as inferior to love for God. The T.U. expresses the concept of God as *Ananda* or *Anandamaya* or *Rasa*—Joy or Love. God's Love-form or the Joy-form is expressed partially in earthly joys or loves. The seeker of God should transcend them all and experience only unconditional and supreme love for God. . So on the strength of the above Shruti it is to be established that devotion which is love for God is superior to knowledge. It is even greater than the state of immortality or knowledge. So according to this, one should get the knowledge of the greatness of God as preliminary requisite and then approach God through love. Here the conditional nature of devotion is indicated but it can be unconditional without knowledge.

One may argue here that God is to be experienced mentally. How can He be visible to the physical eyes. To this Purushottamaji replies that the devotion can be the attribute of mind as love. So whether God is mentally experienced in His Love-form or physically seen, it does not make difference as regards the principle of the superiority of devotion to knowledge. Devotion is to be regarded as the attribute of the soul. As devotion or love for God develops, the desires for worldly or heavenly happiness and even for Moksha are ended. No doubt desires do remain in their sublimated form. A devotee is free from worldly desires, but has the desires for participation in the joy of God, by God's Will which depends solely upon God's Grace. They reject the Grace in favour of their desire for participation in the Joy-form of God in union with Him as a separate entity. Moksha is meant for man of knowledge. The devotees who have dedicated their life to the service of God and seek God only by uncommon and selfless love, are deemed by God as eligible for His Grace. According to Purushottamaji the highest goal is the participation in the Divine Joy, which is to be reached only through love or devotion of God.

Bhakti Rasatva Vada is a work attributed to Pitambarajee, father of Shri Purushottamaji. (See Ch. III, Section I)

WORK BY YOGI GOPESHVARAJI

(7)

Bhakti Martanda: It is a masterly work of Yogi Gopeshvaraji dealing exhaustively and in full details on the Doctrine of Devotion. The title rendered into English means, 'The sun of Devotion'. Devotion is compared with the Sun because just as the Sun is the cause of light and bloom of the vegetable life and eclipses all other luminaries, in the same way the Bhakti is the super means, in God realisation. Its principal ideas are derived from the works of Vallabhacharya, and Vitthaleshaji's Bhakti Hansa and Bhakti Hetu. It is however an independent work testifying to his extraordinary learning and genius as a master thinker in his art of elucidating his subject.

The work is divided into four sections (1) Pramana (2) Prameya (3) Sadhana and (4) Fala. In the first section he establishes his proposition that Devotion is mentioned in the Vedas and other authoritative works as a means for God-realisation. He rejects the views opposed to admitting Devotion as a principle for God realisation. In the second section he differentiates Devotion from knowledge, workship, etc. and explains its real nature. In this section, he discusses the theories which identify devotion with action or knowledge. Action being physical, cannot be devotion, knowledge being intellectual, cannot be devotion. Worship which combines action and knowledge, cannot be devotion. It is mental no doubt but must have emotion of love. He considers two definitions of Devotion, one, by Narada which says that it is supreme and unconditional love for God but having for its pre-requisite the knowledge of the greatness of God, and the other by Shandilya, which dispenses with the knowledge altogether but purely recommends love for God. Again he divides it into two types—the Maryada and the Pushti types. The Maryada is nine fold. It is a means. The other is pure love. It is an end. The goal of the first is Moksha and that of the second is the enjoyment of God's love by

His Grace. These two divisions are also known as *Vihita* or *Vaidhi* Bhakti or scriptural devotion, the other *Avihita* or *Ragatmika*, independent of the scriptures. It is again Pravahika, Maryada Margiya and Pushtimargiya. The nine fold devotion used as a means for Moksha is of the first kind, it is of the second type, if directed to God alone for enjoyment of His love. The last one is the best. It only is the real devotion. It is very often identified with God's Grace—*Anugraha* or *Kripa.* Some identify it with wish of the devotee, but it is not so. Every desire has a tendency to seek happiness, but love does not seek happiness. It often undergoes misery. Again a desire arises from selfish motive but love has no selfish motive. When one loves ones children, one does not wish for any return or happiness from them. It is not desire, nor is it a desire for Moksha. The devotees who love God do not care for it.

The word Bhakti is derived from root 'bhaj' with termination 'ti' added to it. The whole word means love with service for God. It is active, because it requires that the body, the senses, and the mind should be engaged in the service of God. It is the love by which God's love is experienced through physical service in the union (Samyoga) state of love, and mentally in the separation (Viprayoga) state. Thus it carries double meaning of service and love like the words *Pushpavat,* conveying the sense of the Sun and the moon. As the sun it makes the day lotus bloom by its light and as the moon it makes the night lotus bloom. In the same way, in the form of service it becomes the cause of experiencing God in the State of union, and as love in the State of separation from God.

The author then takes up the question whether devotion is to be considered as a separate *Rasa* or *Bhava* as it is known in the works on poetics. He explains the theory of *Rasa.* Incidentally he refers to the views of Bhatta Sollata, Sri Shamku, and Abhinava Gupta and others and differing from them, says that as devotion has its own permanent emotion of love peculiar to it, like other *Rasas* it should be recognised as Bhakti *Rasa.* This is expressed in the devotee's experience of God's love. Love is expressed variously assuming different names as the parental love, the filial love, the fraternal love, the conjugal love, etc. God's love can be experienced in any of the above forms which belong to devotion. Love for God should pass under the name of Bhakti Rasa and that between worldly lovers as Shringara. Yogi Gopeshvara however, says that really speaking love for God does not differ from Shrinagara Rasa. It is the real Shringara, the love for worldly persons is Rasa only in name. Love for God is a spontaneous emotion arising in the hearts of the devotee experiencing God's love. The devotee seeks and obtains God's love by his love for God.

In the third section he proves by innumerable quotations from the Upanishadas, the Gita, the Brahma Sutras and the Puranas—chiefly the Bhagavata that devotion is the best of means. Sacrifice, knowledge, worship, austerity, mental discipline, fasts etc. mentioned in the scriptures are no doubt good for specific purposes, but are useless for enjoyment of God's love—which is the goal of a devotee.

The following references support this statement, by revealing important features of devotion.

Sarvatmabhava—Mundaka Upanishad 3-2-3-

Bhakti Superior to Moksha—J.U. 2-1

Immunity from sins to a devotee. M.U. 2-2-9 & C. V. 5-24-3

Enjoyment of God's love..T.U. 2-1

Grace of God M.U. 3-2-8, K.M. 1-2-20and 1-2-22, S.U.3-20

Revelation of God to the devotee...

The last section is devoted to the delineation of the fruit of devotion. It is not Moksha or heavenly or any other kind of happiness. Since it is not a means but an end, it seeks by its own love the love of God which comes to him in God's Grace. It is reciprocal. God receives the soul's love and gives His own to it. All the desires of the soul in enjoyment of God's love are fulfilled when the love of the devotee reaches the stage of extreme suffering, pangs of separation from God. In that extreme state, God meets the soul and bestows His grace on it, so that it can remain with God and participate in His bliss.

Atmavada is a work of highly polemical character—written by Yogi Gopeshvaraji, well known as author of the Rashmi commentary on the Anu Bhashya. As it discusses various theories on God, it should be strictly speaking entitled as Ishvara—Vada. Some religions believe in the existence of God and some like Buddhism and Jainism, belonging to the non-Vedic groups of Indian Philosophy, Charvaka, a materialist do not. Charvaka admits the existence of four elements—earth, water, air and fire only and rejects soul, God, and life hereafter. Buddhism rejects God but characterises ultimate reality as Sunya and subsequently as Vijnana or consciousness. Among the founders of the Darshana systems, the Samkhya rejects God and accepts Prakriti as a material and an efficient cause of the world. Patanjali accepts God only for meditation purpose but not as the creator, preserver or the destroyer of this world. To him a special God is Purusha who does not reward or punish the souls or cannot grant liberation. The God of Patanjali is omniscient, omnipotent, and omnipresent. He is perfection incarnate and purest knowledge. God is admitted in his system as a practical necessity for concentration. The Vaisheshika system believes in God, only as an efficient cause of the world, the material cause being atoms. The God in this system is simply a supervisor of the world-order. He is not independent master of His Will. It is the Adrishta which has God under its influence. The Nyaya system agrees with the Vaisheshikas. In this system God is one of the souls—a super soul. Udayana has proved the existence of God by the following arguments:

1. The world being an effect, it must have an efficient cause and it must be intelligent. It is God.
2. Unless the atoms are moved by any agent, they cannot themselves combine into the making of the world. God is this agent.
3. The world is to be sustained and destroyed by an intelligent Agent. The *Agent* which is unintelligent cannot sustain or destroy the world. The intelligent Agent is God.
4. The Veda testifies to the existence of God.
5. God is needed to supervise the moral order and for rewarding and punishing for the works of men.

The author of Purva mimansa has no need of God. The purpose of God is served by Karma. Badarayana accepts in toto the Upanishadic conception of God which is designated as Brahman, Atman, Bhuman etc. and who is both Nirakara and Sakara.

Shamkara differentiates Nirakara Brahman from Sakara, who is the cause of the world. This God is not the supreme Reality which has nothing to do with the creation of the world. The Supreme Reality, according to Shamkara is knowledge. Ramanuja accepts only one Brahman as Nirakar and Sakara, and as a material as well as efficient cause of the world and the souls, which are God's attributes. Vallabha agrees with Ramanuja but differs from him in asserting that the world and the souls represent the existence and consciousness aspects of God. God according to him is impersonal and personal. As Akshara he is impersonal and as Purushottama is personal. Purushottama is described as Sat-Chit-Ananda. He uses Krishna for Purushottama, that for supreme God is suggested from the Brahmanand Valli of T.U., the Gopal Tapini Upanishad, the Gita, the Vishnu Purana, the Brahma Vaivarta Purana and the Bhagavata Purana. The word "Krishna" is explained etymologically to represent two ideas—one of Existence in the root—"Krish" and Bliss in "Na". The combined meaning of it implies that Krishna is the repository of eternal Existence and Bliss. "Sadananda" can also be used for Krishna. God as Krishna is Perfect Bliss or Rasa according to T.U. In other words, Vallabha's concept of God expresses—Truth, knowledge or goodness and Beauty or Joy or Love—of the three the last one is predominant in His nature. Yogi Gopeshwara rejects the views of other writers.

He says that the logical methods adopted by other schools to prove the existence of God by proofs—such as perception, inference etc., are not satisfactory. Knowledge of God should be derived from the holy scriptures—the Vedas, the Gita, the B.S. and the Bhagavata not by one's efforts but by the grace of God. The efforts of other schools of thought are admirable but lack sincerity, as their arguments are not solely based on the Upanishadas. They have endeavoured to prove the existence of God in their own way, absolutely by inference.

Prameya Ratnarnava (The Ocean of the gems of Prameya—Knowledge): This is a small treatise by Balkrishna Bhatta, limited to a few important topics of the philosophy and Religion of the Vallabha School. It is an independent work in the form of an Epitome or Guide, touching only essential points. The matter is treated under seven heads which are knowables or Prameya (1) relating to the world (2) nature of the soul (3) Nature of God (4) Pushti Bhakti—Devotion of the type of love (5) Qualifications needed for eligibility of the souls for the path of Pushti (6) Sarvatmabhava or Realisation of God in all forms and (7) fruit of the Pushti devotion. He is more interested in religion rather than in the Philosophy of the Vallabha School. The world is the physical aspect of God, the spiritual being Akshara and transcendental or Divine-Krishna. The world is real because it is manifested by God from His being aspect for His *Lila* through the instrumentality of His power called Maya which is subject to God's will. The souls are principally of three kinds (1) the Divine (2) the human and (3) the demonic. The human souls who seek worldly happiness are Pravaha souls. The Divine are (a) The Pushti who solely depend upon God's grace by their love of God, and (b) The Maryada are those whose goal is liberation by the scriptural means of knowledge and devotion. The Pushti souls are of four categories (1) Shuddha Pushti. (2) Pushti Pushti (3) Maryada Pushti (4) and Pravaha Pushti, according to their mental inclinations. Although they love God, Pravaha Pushti souls' aspirations for worldly status are not removed. The Maryada souls of the Pushti type make scriptures their sole guides in the matter of worldly dealings and spiritual life. The Pushti Pushti and Shuddha Pushti souls have nothing to do with the world or the scriptures. They live only for God's love. They know, none but God, and love none but God.

The author recognises God in four forms (1) As Purushottama or Krishna in His Bliss or Love form (2) As Akshara—attainable by knowledge (3) as the abode of God attainable by devotion and (4) As Antaryamin-Dweller in the heart of each man. The goal of the highest souls must be enjoyment of God's love in His Bliss or Love form. It is not to be got by one's efforts, but by God's grace which follows in the wake of complete surrender to God and realisation of God everywhere.

BHASHYA LITERATURE ON THE UPANISHADS

Vallabhacharya has not written any Bhashya on any of the Upanishadas, as Shamkaracharya has, but some learned scholars of his school have tried their pens on select Upanishadas. Their main object is to derive principles of the Suddhadvaita philosophy from these works. This sort of activity was started by Purushottamaji by his commentary on the M.U. In this work, he refutes Gaudapdaacharya's (*Ajat Vada*) theory of non-origination, which negatively means that the world being only an appearance is in fact never created and positively it means that the Absolute being self existent is never created. This is nothing but Shunyavada (Theory of Voidness) of the Bauddhas. Gaudapada believed that it was taught by the M.U. ButPurushottamaji proves that the claim of Gaudapada does not stand. Shamkara who under Gaudapada's influence preached the theory of illusion, has failed to understand the real meaning of this Upanishad. The Upanishad teaches Brahma Vada theory of Brahman being a material and efficient cause of the world. He further gives his opinion that Maya (Illusion) has no basis so far this Upanishad is concerned.

Jaya Gopala Bhatta's Bhashya on T.U. is another attempt to establish the Bliss (Ananda) Form or Love (Rasa) form of God which is the Highest form, also known as Para Brahman. Compared with this the unmanifest or impersonal Akshara is inferior. This Upanishad is the basis of the Shuddhadvaita conception of of God in Love or Bliss form, represented in the Bhagavata as Krishna. In this Upanishad, stress is laid for the first time on the bliss aspect of God. It refers to five forms of God—physical (Annamaya) Vital (Pranamaya) mental (Manomaya) spiritual (Vijnanmaya) and Ananadamaya. Shamkara and Bhamati describe these as sheaths but Jaya Gopal on the authority of Vallabha's Bhashya on Ananadmayadhikaran in the Brahma Sutras, describes first four as Vibhuties—special forms of God, revealing some excellent qualities predominantly. The last form Anandmaya and Anand are one. No doubt the terminal 'Maya' is added to 'Anand' but it does not mean 'made of Ananda', it rather conveys the sense of fullness. It is Supreme God, superior to Akshara or Brahman and is Perfect Love realised only by love for God.

Goswami Aniruddhacharya of Nadiad has made an excellent attempt in his Bhashya on Gopal Tapini Upanishad to establish that the concept of Krishna is as old as the Upanishadas. It is not an invention of the Acharyas of later times. His Bhashya on Narayan Upanishad gives answer to those who oppose devotion, saying that it is not taught in the Upanishadas. This Upanishad declares single minded devotion as the best means for God-realisation.

Balkrishna Shastri's Mansvini commentary on Kenopanishad, gives valuable information about some important principles of Shuddhadvaita indicated in this Upanishad. He divides the subject of the Upanishadas into four sections—Pramana, Prameya, Sadhana and Fala. In the first section, supremacy of devotion is established, in the second it is established that God alone is knowledge, in the third it is asserted that work, knowledge and other means are not completely flawless, but only devotion is flawless. In the last section, it is propounded that the goal of devotion is realisation of God. Thus, the author in this work has made a creditable effort in deducing the principles of Shuddhadvaita philosophy from this Upanishad. Mukhia Gokuldasji has also written a commentary on this Upanishad.

T.U. has five commentators—Balkrishna Shastri, Balbhadra Sharma, Mohanlal Shastri, Kanthamani Sharma and Sabal Kishora Chaturvedi. They have been all written with the zeal of propounding Suddhadvaita God's omnipresence. His being a substratum of opposite qualities, His dual aspects as qualified and non-qualified, importance of Vedic action and knowledge, and need of their co-ordination for devotion to God, condemnation of Vidya and Avidya as osbtacles to the realisation of God, sense of belonging to God which makes Dedication and submission to God imperative,—these are some of the doctrines touched in this Upanishad.

Pandit Ramanatha's Bhashya on the Chhandogya, though incomplete, is a good attempt. It discovers the bliss-form of God from Bhuman which is used there for Brahman. Prof. G. H. Bhatta has explained the Kathopanishad as a brief for Brahma Vada and Pushti Bhakti. Dr. M. P. Mody's work on the Manduka is an admirable attempt, interpreting it in the light of Shuddhadvaita.

Vedanta Chintamani is by Pandit Gattulala written in verse form. It covers up almost all the topics of Shuddhadvaita. It was suggested to him on reading Panchadashi of Vidyaranya Swami. It is divided into 15 chapters, each dealing with a particular topic.

It is based on the Anu Bhashya, T.D.N. of Vallabhacharya, Vidvan Mandana of Vitthalesha and Shuddhadvaita Martanda of Girdharaji. Its main object is to put in easy form, the teachings of Shuddhadvaita within the reach of ordinary readers. It touches all the main principles and yet is a gist of that philosophy. The following analysis will give a general idea about its contents.

Ch.	I	Criticism of materialists and atheists and establishment of the existence of God by several proofs.
	II	Discussion of various kinds of proofs for the knowledge of God and recognition of the scriptures alone in the Shuddhadvaita School. The Scriptures include only the Vedas, the Gita the Brahm Sutras and the Bhagavata and also the Smrutis and Puranas as well as epics like Ramayana and also Jaimini's Bhashya, if they support the above named scriptures.
	III	God's manifestation as world and the souls from His Being and consciousness aspects and His immanence as well as transcendence and oneness in these diverse forms.
	IV	Refutation of the illusionist teaching of the world and establishment of its reality.
	V	God's powers of manifestation and non-manifestation. The world as not a product or origination but manifestation of God from His being part.
	VI	Refutation of the *Vikrit Parinamavada*-theory of the world as a modification from Prakriti, admitted by the Samkhyas, and propounding of *Avikrita Parinama Vada*—the theory of change as the world from Brahman without modification illustrated with examples.
	VII	Emanation of the souls from Brahman and their worldly bondage due to superimpositions on account of the impact of nescience.
	VIII-IX	Characteristics of the souls and their difference from *Antaryamin*, and refutation of the theory that the soul is a reflection of Brahman into nescience, and relations of the soul to God.

X Promulgation of Brahman's being qualified as well as non-qualified. One God is in both the aspects—positively and negatively viewed—the positive view asserting God's divine qualities, and the negative view denying worldly qualities.

XI-XII Examination of Ramanuja's Vishishtadvaita and refutation of the Shaiva and Shakta theories.

XIII Exposition of Shuddhadvaita principles Re: the world, Akshara, Antaryamin and their differences from Purushottama—the Supreme God.

XIV Discrimination between Prakriti and Purusha and description of Akshara.

XV Nature of liberation and supremacy of Pushti Bhakti—Devotion of the type of love—for attainment of Supreme God, and enjoyment of His Bliss.

Pandit Gattulala had a profil pen which gave him a reputation of a scholar of the first order and a renowned author. His Shuddhadvaita Chandrodaya and some commentaries on the Upanishadas and notes on the Anu Bhashya and the Tattva Dipa Nibandha were highly appreciated by his contemporaries in the literary circles. But his monumental work on the Shuddhadvaita Philosophy is his commentary Maruta Shakti (Power of the wind on the Prabhanjan by Goswami Shri Kanaiyalal Maharaja) designed as a reply to the work entitled Sahasraksha by one Sadananda who wrote it with a view to criticising the two most authentic works of the Shuddhadvaita School—(1) Vidvan Mandana and (2) Shuddhadvaita Martanda. Gattulala's Maruta Shakti is his unique contribution to the Shuddhadvaita philosophy in the 20th century, after Purushottamaji. It is a vindication of that philosophy, which in his days, was subjected to severest criticism by the advocates of Shamkara's Mayavada.

The Vallabha School did not rest contented with merely oral instruction through regular religious discourses by the Acharyas, and the scholars, but put their teachings in systematic writings, which activities extended over a period of more than four hundred years. The body of literature produced by the combined efforts of these Acharyas and the scholars, is so large, well-rounded and symmetrical in each part integrated with others so as to give only the impression of the unity of its thought regarding God, both in in quality and quantity, that, it is strong enough to triumph over the ravages of time. Its gem-like truths are most precious of purest ray serene for they are discovered from the ocean of the Vedas and as such will retain their lustre as long as the Vedas will exist. To a dispassionate student of the Indian philosophy and Religion, Vallabhacharya's philosophy and religion will appeal most in understanding the heart of the Hindu Philosophy and Religion. Although all his works are par excellence in their super teaching *Anu Bhashya* and the *subodhini* commentary on the Bhagavata constitute land marks of the epoch of the renaissance of the Hindu Philosophy and Religion. They are like beacon lights to the ship-wrecked sojourners of the ocean—mundane existence, full of trouble, stress and storm. In short, they have health restoring virtue and as such can be trusted for all the time by the spiritual aspirants as having potentiality in fighting shy of the cankerous disease of materialism and atheism, and healing the wounds of life and in pointing to the glory of God.

SOME IMPORTANT WORKS ON SHUDDHADVAITA PHILOSOPHY

Sanskrit Books

Anu Bhashya with Prakash & Rashmi (13 Volumes)
Anu Bhashya with Vivaran (3 Volumes)
Anu Bhashya with Pradipa
Patravalambana
Prasthana Ratnakar
Vidvan Mandana with Commentaries
Prabhanjan with Maruta Shakti
Vadavali
Shuddhadvaita Martanda
Mandukya Upanishada-Bhashya
Gopal Purva Tapini Upanishada-Bhashya
Narayan Upanishada-Bhashya
Ishavasyopanishad-Bhashya.
Chandogya-Upanishad Bhashya
"Sixteen Works with Commentaries (16 Volumes)
Tatva Dipa Nibandha' (3 Volumes)
Shri Subodhini (17 Volumes)
Shuddhadvaita Sanskrit Vangamaya (2 Volumes)

English Books

A Primer of Anu Bhashya
Discussion etc of Brahmasutras (By Teliwala)

Can be had from:

PUSHTIMARGIYA LIBRARY
Santh Pipli,
NADIAD (Gujarat, India)

APPENDIX I

Vishnuswamy and Shri Vallabhacharya

It will not be out of place at this juncture to refer to the controversial question regarding Vishnuswamy's so called influence on Vallabhacharya in the promulgation of his new philosophy of Suddhadvaita and the doctrine of Devotion. The view that Vallabhacharya was influenced by Vishnuswamy is not tenable in the light of recent researches by the scholars. The view under question held by some followers of Pushti Marga, was due to Gadadhara's view expressed in his work "Sampradaya Pradipa" written long ago, i.e. in the 16th Century (Gadadhara was born in 1554 A.D.) Except this solitary work, we have no other works in the School of Vallabhacharya, on record to substantiate this view. Modern scholars of the Vallabha School on examination from the materials available to them have found it erroneous. From the internal evidence available from Vallabhacharya's writings, they conclude that his philosophy and the doctrine of devotion taught by Vallabhacharya are his own and have nothing to do with Vishnuswamy.

In support of this, the following facts should be noted:

1. We have no positive evidence concerning particulars under whose influence he is supposed to have come, for, there were many religious teachers bearing that name. One Vishnuswamy was the son of Yagneswara Hari, another Vishnuswamy was a Mimansaka and a third by that name is referred to by Sridhara in his commentary on the Vishnu Purana. According to Sridhara, he was the author of the work-'Sarvagna Sukti'.

2. If we take it for granted that it was the Vishnuswamy referred to by Sridhara, then we are not on sure ground regarding this influence on Vallabhacharya; for this Vishnuswamy taught devotion to Narasimha Avatara (Lion form) incarnation of God Vishnu, and not Krishna Avatara. However there is a similarity in the teachings of both that the world is real, and Maya is the power of God. They also consider the soul as suffering

on account of its forgetfulness of its relation to God. Except this similarity, there is, otherwise a great difference between their doctrines.

3. The view, in question, of Gadadhara, is not supported by Shri Vitthalesji, son of Vallabhacharya, and other Acharyas. There is not even a bare indication of it in their writings.

4. It is pointed out that Vallabhacharya's work viz. Tattvadipa Nibandha has an indication that Vallabhacharya was an interpreter of Vishnuswamy's view. This occurs at the end of the work in the colophon. But here we should be on our guard against interpreting it in the sense of Vallabhacharya's being a follower of Vishnuswamy. Vallabhacharya merely expresses his views on the nature of God, the soul and the Universe, which happened to be, incidentally, similar to those of Vishnuswamy. His views were original and the similarity is only accidental.

5. Vallabhacharya has himself stated in his Subodhini commentary on the Bhagavata, 3-12-37 that Vishnuswamy's devotion was of the Tamas kind (the lowest type of devotion), Madhava's was of the Rajas kind, Ramanuja's of the Sattva kind and his own was of a non-qualified nature. This observation of Vallabhacharya, if dispassionately considered, will lend countenance to the view that he did not follow the footsteps of Vishnuswamy. His philosophical and religious teachings are independent, being derived directly from the Scriptures. All that we can say in all fairness is that Vallabhacharya was in his early youth impressed by Vishnuswamy. Vallabhacharya's ancestors and his father Lakshamana Bhatta worshipped Gopala as their Deity which was a characteristic feature of Vishnuswamy's faith. Vallabhacharya commends his father as a worshipper of Gopipati (Lord of the Gopis) at the beginning of his Subodhini Commentary. Purushottamji, commenting on this, remarks that this worship of Gopipati is tantamount to worship of Gopala. From this, we can conclude that Vallabhacharya's father was a follower of Vishnuswamy and probably in his early youth Vallabhacharya might have thought of God, the soul, the Universe and Maya in terms of Vishunuswamy's philosophy but later on he was absolutely free from his influence. He was an original thinker. His philosophy and doctrine of devotion are original and independent of Vishnuswamy's

teachings. Besides, the historical authenticity of Vishnuswamy's personality is doubtful. Also none of his work is available. It is not known by him that he was a founder of any school. If any of his works existed it is probable that they were not known to the scholars in Vallabhacharya's time. Thus there is no authentic or historical evidence to support the view that Vallabhacharya was a follower of Vishnuswamy. In our opinion it is a myth fabricated perhaps by some interested writers.

8. Das Gupta, an eminent scholar of oriental learning, has proved this theory as a fake in his work on the History of Indian Philosophy, Vol. IV, page 382. He asserts that not only there is a difference between Vallabhacharya and Vishnuswamy in their teachings of 'Devotion' and the nature of Brahman but Vallabhacharya's devotion is qualityless, that of Vishnuswamy predominates Tamas. Vallabhacharya emphasises the pure monistic texts of the Upanishads and regards Brahman as undifferentiated as one with Himself and as one with His qualities. Vishnuswamy emphasises the duality implied in the Vedantic texts. Prof. S. Das Gupta says that an anonymous writer of a work 'Sakala Acharya Mata Sangraha' is responsible for originating this traditional belief but it should not be credited. According to Yogi Gopeswara, Vallabhacharya's three-fold teachings—the Adhibhautika, the Adhyatmika and the Adhidaivika have been enunciated in his Anu Bhashya on the Brahma Sutras, the Tattva Dipa Nibandha and the Subodhini on the Bhagvata respectively. The last one is the development of his independent thinking. Chronologically it is possible that in the early period of his life, during his study time and the first tour, he might have, following the foot steps of his father, shown some inclination towards the teachings of Vishnuswamy, but that does not justify that his concepts of the Brahma Vada and of the Pushti Bhakti, are borrowed from Vishnuswamy.

For detailed information on this question, the readers are requested to read Prof. G. H. Bhatt's article on Vishnuswamy and Vallabhacharya and treatment of the same by Prof. K. K. Shastri. ('Vallabhacharya' Ch. II)

APPENDIX II

CHAPTER I

Bibliography

1. "Sampradaya Pradipa" by Gadadhara in Sanskrit.
2. "Yadunatha Digvijaya"
3. Life of Shri Vallabhacharya" by Shripat Shastri in Sanskrit.
4. "Shri Vallabha Kalpa Druma" by Saryudasa.
5. "Life of Vallabhacharya" by Lallubhai P. Parekh (Gujarati)
6. Lectures on Vallabhacharya by M. G. Shastri
7. "A Biographical Sketch of Vallabhacharya" by M. T. Teliwala, as an introduction to Anu-Bhashya (English)
8. "Shri Vallabhacharya" by M. C. Parekh (English)
9. "Shri Vallabhacharya Mahaprabhuji" by K. K. Shastri (Gujarati)
10. "An Article on Vishnuswami and Vallabhacharya" by Prof. G. H. Bhatt (English)
11. A work in Hindi—"The History of Kankaroli".
12. Vallabhacharya Published by G. A. Nateson & Co., Madras.

CHAPTER II

1. "Anu Bhashya" by Vallabhacharya
2. "Tattva Dipa Nibandha " Parts I & II" by Vallabhacharya
3. "Siddhanta Muktavali" by Vallabhacharya
4. Vitthaleshji's "Vidvan Mandana" translated by N. Gandhi.
5. Avaranbhanga, Suvarna Sutra, Prakasha Commentaries and Prasthana Ratnakara, Srishtibhedavada of Purushottamjii (Translated by Dr. P. Katrecha.)
6. "Shuddhadvaita Martanda" by Girdharji.
7. "Vedanta Chintamani" by Pandit Gattulalaji.
8. An Essay on "Shamkara's Refutation of the Samkhya Theory" by M. G. Shastri.
9. "Shuddhadvaita Pradipa" by M. G. Shastri.
10. An Essay on "How far Shamkara truly represents the view of Badarayana Vyasa" by M. T. Teliwala.

11. "Shuddhadvaita Darshana" by J. G. Shah
12. "Indian Philosophy" by Dr. Radhakrishnan
13. "An Idealist View of Life" by Dr. Radhakrishnan
14. "History of Indian Philosophy Vol. IV" by S. Dasa Gupta
15. "Six Systems of Indian Philosophy" by Maxmuller
16. "The Upanishads"
17. "The Brahma **S**utras of Badarayana"
18. "Indian Philosophy" by Dr. Chandradhara Sharma
19. "Vallabha" by P. Johanns.
20. "Akshara" by Dr. P. M. Mody
20. "Six Systems " by Datta and Chatterji
21. History of Indian Philosophy hy N. D. Mehta in Gujarati.

CHAPTER III

1. "The Sixteen Works of Shri Vallabhacharya"
2. "The *Subodhini* Commentary on the Bhagavata
3. "The *Bhakti Hetu* of Vitthaleshji"
4. "The *Bhakti Hansa* of Vitthaleshji"
5. "The *Bhakti Rasata Vada*" by Purushottamaji
6. "The *Bhakti Martanda*" by Yogi Gopeshwaraji
7. "The Works of Shri Hariraiji"
8. "The Life of Shri Vallabhacharya" by M. C. Parekh
9. "Vallabha Through Christ" by P. Johanns.
10. "Introductions to the Sixteen Works of Shri Vallabhacharya" by M. T. Teliwala & Dhirajbhai. V. Shankalia
11. "*Bhakti Sutra*" by Shandilya
12. "*Narada Bhakti Sutras*"
13. "Letters" by Arvindo
14. "The Shuddhadwaita Interpretation" by Dr. N. G. Shah M. A. Phd.

CHAPTER IV

1. "History of Indian Philosophy" by S. Das Gupta
2. "History of Indian Philosophy" by Dr. Radhakrishnan
3. "History of Indian Philosophy" by Dr. Chandradhara Sharma
4. "History of Indian Philosophy 2 Vols." in Gujarati by N. D. Maheta
5. "The Tattva Dipa Nibandha Part I-II" by Vallabhacharya and "Vallabhacharya's Bhashya on the Brahma Sutras
7. "The Vadavali"

8. "An Outline of Indian History" by Prof. Hiranayana
9. "Shuddhadvaita Martanda" by Giradharji
10. "Vidvan Mandan" by Shri Vitthaleshji
11. "Prasthana Ratnakara" by Purushottamji
12. "The Shuddhadvaita Pradipa" by Prof. M. G. Shastri
13. "An Introduction to Anu Bhashya" Translated into Gujarati by Prof. J. G. Shah
14. "The Life Divine" and
15. "The Essays on the Gita and Letters " by Shri Arvindo.

CHAPTER V

1. "Elements of Metaphysics" by A. E. Taylor
2. "The Principles of Philosophy" by H. Bhattacharya
3. "Principles of Philosophy" by Patric
4. "A Story of Philosophy" by Will Durant
5. "The Reign of Religion in Contemporary Philosophy" by Dr. Radhakrishnan
6. "A Guide to Philosophy" by Joad

CHAPTER VI

1. "Subodhini" by Vallabhacharya
2. "Religion and Society" by Dr. Radhakrishnan
3. "East and West" by Dr. Radhakrishnan
4. "The Bhagavad Gita"

CHAPTER VII

1. "The Stories of 84 and 252 Vaishnavas"
2. "The Varieties of Religious Experiences" by Prof. James
3. "Means and Ends " by Alduous Huxley
4. "An Idealist View of Life" by Dr. Radhakrishnan
5. "The Gita—A Book of God-Realisation" by Dr. Ranade
6. "Letters of Aurbindo"—Vol. 1 and 2.
7. "Lectures on the Philosophy of Religion" Vol. 1. by Hegal
8. "Mysticism" by Underwood
9. "God and Evil" by C. E. M. Joad

CHAPTER VIII

1. "The Life Divine" by Shri Arvindo
2. "Principles of Philosophy" by H. M. Bhattacharya
3. "The Problem of Reality" by Dr. A. G. Gavadekar

4. "The Love of the Gopis" by Hanuman Poddar (The Kalyan Press)
5. "Moral Values and the Idea of God" by Sorley
6. "Vallabha" by P. Johannes
7. "Vallabhacharya" by M. C. Parekh
8. "Bhakti Rasatva Vada" by Pitambarji
9. "Bhakti Hansa" by Vitthaleshji

CHAPTER IX

1. "The Philosophy of the Beautiful" by Knight
2. "The Principles of Philosophy" by Dr. H. M. Bhattacharya
3. "The Idea of the Holy" by Dr. Olto

CHAPTER X

1. "Introduction to Anu Bhashya" by Teliwala
2. "Vadavali" edited by Ramanath
3. "Hariraiji" by J. G. Shah
4. "Purushottamaji" by H. O. Shastri
5. "Introduction to Vidvan Mandana" by N. N. Gandhi

APPENDIX III

Glossary of Words

Abhasa: Phenomenal appearance
Achit: Unconsciousness, matter
Advaita: Non-duality
Adhyasa: Superimposition, mistaking one thing for another
Ahamkara: Ego
Ajnana: Ignorance
Amsa (Amsha): A part
Antahkarana: Internal sense or organ, mind
Anugraha: Grace
Anvaya: Connection
Anuvada: Theory of atoms, atomism
Archana: Worship
Ashraya: Resort, refuge
Asakti: Attachment
Atman: Spirit, soul
Atma-nivedana: Dedication of the self to God, consecration
Anumana-pramana: Proof by inference
Anupalabdhi-pramana: Proof by negation
Ananda: Joy, bliss
Asat-Karya-Vada: The theory of non-existence of the effect
Avidya: Ne-science
Avikrita-parinama-vada: The theory of non-modification of Brahman
Avirbhava: Manifestation
Arthapatti: Proof by implication
Akshara: Immutable Brahman
Antaryami: In-dwelling God
Annamaya: God manifested as the world in His physical aspect
Anandamaya: Supreme God, God's aspect in the form of bliss
Bhagavat: God as possessor of six qualities or properties viz. power, valour, fame, glory (or wealth), knowledge and asceticism (i.e., absence of worldly desires)

Bhakti: Devotion

Bhakti-marga: Path of devotion

Bhakta: A devotee

Brahman: Supreme Lord, God

Brahma-sambandha: A ceremony of soul's association with God

Bruhat: Aksara, an immutable form of God

Brahma: Creator of the world, one of the trinity of God

Bhava: Emotion

(Sthayi)Bhava: permanent emotion, such as love, pathos, anger etc.

(Anu)Bhava: Expression of emotion through physical actions i.e. by limbs

(Vyabhicari)Bhava: Passing feelings

(Uddipana)Vibhava: That which induces the inherence emotion to rise and manifest, such as environment, place, occasion, etc.

(Alambana)-vibhava : That in whom the emotion rises, the bearer or the support of emotion

Bhrama : Illusion

Buddhi : Intellect

Bhuta : Element (five elements — Pancha-mahabhutas — are earth, water, air, fire, (or light) and sky (or ether)

Bhedabheda : Theory of difference and non-difference between God and the world

Cit(Chit) : Consciousness

Citta(Chitta) : Mind (a kind of antahkarana)

Dharma : Religion, duty

Dhairya : Patience

Dvyanuka : Drayads

Dvaita : Duality, dualism

Dvaitadvaita : Duality in non-duality

Dasya-bhakti : Devotion of God in the form of servitude

Dehadhyasa : Superimposition of the body on the soul, mistaking body for the soul

Indriya : Inner organ or sense (there are five organs or senses of action and five organs or senses of knowledge).

Indriyadhyasa : Mistaking senses or organs for the soul

Jagat : World, universe

Jnana : Knowledge

Jiva : Embodied soul

Kevaladvaita : Theory of absolute non-dualism

Kaivalya : Liberation in the form of merging into Brahman

Kirtana-bhakti : Devotion by reciting God's glorious deeds

Khyati-vada : Theory of error

Karma : Action, work

Karan : Sense, instrument

Maya : Illusion, according to Shamkaracharya, and a power of God which is responsible for the creation of the world and conditioning Him as finite according to Vallabhacharya

Maryada-marga : A path of knowledge and devotion resorted to by the souls to realise Brahman according to scriptures

Nirodha : A religious discipline of controlling the mind, by which the soul becomes detached from the world and is attached to God

Nirguna
Nirakara } Indeterminate Brahman
Nirvishesha

Nirvana : Extinction, condidtion of desirelessness

Pushti(Pusti) : Grace of God

Pusti-marga : Path of devotion depending on Divine Grace

Pravaha-marga : Path or worship, resorted by men with attachment to worldliness and engrossed in rituals without understanding

Prakriti (Prakrati) Pradhana: Matter, nature, the unconcious element

Purusha (Purusa) : Soul

Purusharthas : Ends or aims of human life

Parmatman : God, the Highest Soul

Parinama-vada : Theory of change or transformation of God in the form of the world

Pratyaksha (Pratyaksa) : Perception

Pramana : Means of proof, proof of knowledge

Prapancha (prapanca) : The visible world of manifold actions and illusion

Prapatti : Surrender, sense of surrender

Pratibimba : Reflection

Samsara : Mundane-existence

Samavaya : Inherence

Seva : Service of God; tanuja-seva is service by body; vittaja-seva is service by wealth, and manasi-seva is mental-service.

Sarvatma-bhava : A condition of a devotee in which he realises God in all forms and things
Samarpana : Dedication, consecration
Sneha : Affection, love
Sanyasa : Renunciation
Sharana : Resort to God
Shastras (Sastras) : Scritputes
Shriti : Vedas
Smriti(Smrti) : Scriptures based upon the Vedas
Shreyas (S'reyas) : The good
Shristi(Srsti) : Creation, world
Shravana Bhakti : Devotion in the form of listening the accounts of God's mighty deeds
Sadhana : Means or instrument

Vishva(Vis'va) : World, universe
Vivarta-vada : The theory of phenomenal appearance of the world, advocated by Shamkaracharya
Varana : Choice
Vyasana : State of desolation during separation from God, assiduous devotion
Viveka : Discrimination
Vyuha : Aspect of God Krisna (they are four; Vasudeva for granting wisdom, Aniruddha for maintaining dharma, Pradyumna for begetting progeny, and Samkrsana for destroying evils)
Vritti (vrtti) : Tendency of mind
Vasana : Desire
Vairagya : Indifference to the world, ascetic attitude
Virya : Potentiality, i.e. a quality of God
Vyanjana : A power of the world by which the suggested meaning is understood
Varna : A letter or an alphabet, colour, a social class or caste
Vikara : Change, modification
Vishistadvaita : Qualified non-dualism, a theory propounded by Ramanujacharya
Viruddha-Dharmashraya : The theory which maintains that God is a substratum of contrary attirubtes
Virata : Universal, or cosmic form of God

APPENDIX IV

References to the texts supporting the principles of the Shuddhadvaita School

Nature of Brahman (God) — S.3.2. 11 to 30, Sh.M.8.Bh.G. XIII, 12-16, T.D.N.I. 65-68, 73, 71 T.U. 2-4, K.U. 2-4-1, S.U. 6-8, B.U. 1-3-22, B.S. 3-54-5, V.M. 195-196

Brahman as a creator of the world. Bh. G.XIV. 3; T.D.N.I. 13-15; T.U., 2-6-1, 2-7, 3-1, B.U. 1-4-3, C.U. 5-25-2; B.S. 1-1-2, 3, 1-4-26, 27; M.U. 1-1-6

Brahman as a material and efficient cause — T.D.N.I. 68, 76, 77, B.S. 1-4-23

Brahman as Bliss — B.S. 1-1-11 to 18, 4-2-15; T.U. 27, C.U. 7-23

Brahman-Krishna — S.M. 11,17 — N.B.S. A.P., K.A. 1-10

Immanence of God — Bh.G. IX-XI, T. D.N.I. 13 II, 241-251

Transcendence of God — Bh.G.X-42

Akshara — Bh.G. VIII—28, XI-18, B.S. 1-3-10 to 12; 3-3-34; T.U. 2-8.

Akshara and Purushottama — S.M. 9, K.A. 8, Bh. VIII. 22, XII 4, 5, XV-18.

God's powers of manifestation and non-manifestation — T.D.N.I. 72; II, 140, Sh.M. 14, V.M. 75-85

Unmodified nature of Brahman — B.S. 2-1-24, 25 to 37, S.U. 6-19, Sh.M. 12, 13

Difference between the world and mundane existence — T.D.N.I. 23-24

Reality of the world — Bh.G. XV—8, T.D.N.I. 49, 78 to 90, C.U. 2-2, T.U. 2-6, B.G. 2-1-15 to 19

Nature of the Soul — B.S. 2-4-4 to 25, K.U. 2-18 to 29, Sh. M. 9 V.M. 135-157.

Size of the Soul — T.D.N.I. 53, 54, B.U. 4-3-9, 4-4-43, B.S. 2-3-20-21, S.U. 5-9, C.U. 8-1 Sh.M. 10, V.M. 182-193.

Relation of the Soul to God—Bh.G. XV, B S. 2-3-43, M.U. 3-1-1 B.S. 10-10-2, S.U. 4-1, K.U. 3-1.

Divisions of the Souls — P.P.M. 1 to 10

Maya — S.Bh. 2-5-12, 19, 2-7-47, 3-7-9, T.D.N.I. 38-80,89,M.K.

II 19-21, III 1 to 27, 28, IV, 54, 61, N. VII 27, XII, 17 XIII-4-3-11, Sh-B. S. 8-5-2-20.

Reflection Theory T.D.N. I. 57-60, V.M. 61

Fivefold creation T.D.N.I. 36-39

Theory of Action — B-S-3-4-2 to 25.

Sacrifice — B.G.IV 23 to 33, T.D.N.I. 11, II 1 to 13

Superiority of Knowledge over Action — Bh.G. IV, 36-37.

Ignorance and its five forms — T.D.N.I. 17

Knowledge and its five forms — T.D.N.I. 45-46

Knowledge and Ignorance as powers of God — T.D.N.I. 31

Nature of Action, Knowledge and Devotion — T.D.N.I. 17

Devotion — Bh.G. IV—11, VI, 47, VIII,22, IX 26, 36, X 10, XI. 54, XII 14 to 20, 26, XV, 19, XVIII, 54, 55, 68. N.B.S.

Devotion of the Love type — B.V. 4-5. T.D.N.I. 101, II, 196, 229, 310, 328. Bh. He. Bh.H, Bh.M., Sh. B.S.

Sarvatmabhava — B.S. 3-3-42 to 3-3-53; Bh.M.

Devotion as a sentiment of love — B.S. 3-3-38, 43, 57, T.U. 2-7, S.Bh. 10-44-4. Bh.R.V.; Bh.M.

Doctrine of Grace — Pushti — S.M. 18; T.D.N.I. 63. M.U. 3-2-3, 4, B.G. II, 3,42 IV, 3-29; II 4-46; IV 1-15, 2, 6, 49 B.S. 3-4-3 to 4-2-7, 3-4-46; S.N.6. N.L. 12-13, T.D.N.I. 48-49. S.Bh. 10-26-42; 10-30-46. S.Bh. 10-9-10, 3-21-38, 2-10-6

Liberation — T.D.N.I. 14, 36, 42; II. 313. B.S. 4-4-2,24, B.U. 4-4-2. C.U. 7-25-2.

Affinity with God — S.R.2.

Renunciation — S.N. 1 to 21.

Nirodha — N.L. 1 to 20.

Divine Service — S.M. 1 T.D.N.I. 316. S.Bh 1-5-25; 3-13-6, 10-1-2; 10-26-33, 10-33-1; 10-84-20; 10-84-27

Surrender — B. G. XVIII — 62, 65. S.Bh. 10-25-4; 3-25-33, A.P. 8

Scriptural authority — T.D.N.I. 7 to 9, II 284.

APPENDIX V

A LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

Antahkaran Prabodha	A.P.
Aitiriya Unpanishad	A.U.
Anu Bhasya	A.B.
Bhagavad Gita	B.G./Bh.G.
Bhagavata	BH./Bhg.
Bhagvatarth Prakaran	BH.P.
Bhakti Hansa Nirnaya	Bh.H.
Bhakti Hetu	Bh.He.
Bhakti Martanda	Bh.M.
Bhakti-Rasatvavada	Bh.R.V.
Bhakti vardhini	B.V.
Brahmasutras	B-S.
Brihadaranyka Upanishad	B-U.
Chatu Shloki	C-S.
Chhangogya Upanishad	C-U.
Gopal Tapini Upanishad	G.U.
Ishavasyopanishad Ishopanishad	I-U.
Jaimini Mimansa	J.M.
Jal Bheda	J.B.
Kathopanishad	K-U.
Krishnashrya	K-A.
Mandukya Upanishad	Ma.U.
Mandukya Karika	M.K.
Mundaka Upanishad	M-U.
Narayana Upanishad	N.U.
Navaratna	N-R.
Nirodha Lakshana	N-L.
Narada Bhakti Sutra	N-B-S.
Nirukti	N.
Pancha Padyani	P-P.
Patravalambanam	P.L.
Pushti-Pravaha-Maryada	P.M.
Prameya Ratnarnava	P.R.
Prasthan Ratnakara	P.RT.
Sanyasa Niranaya	S-N..
Seva Falam	S-F
Shuddhadvaita Martanada	Sh-M.
Shvatashvetara Upanishad	Sh-U.
Siddhanta Muktavali	S.M.
Siddhanta Rahasya	S-R.
Subhodhini	S.Bh./Bhg.S.
Shandilya Bhakti Sutra	Sh.B.S.
Shatapatha Brahmana	S.B.
Taittiriya Upanishad	T-U.
Tattva Dipa Nibandha	T-D-N.
Vidvan Mandana	V-M
Viveka-Dhairya-Ashraya	V-D-A.

APPENDIX VI

An Index of the references to the authors

Addler 317, 364
Alduous Haxley 308
Aniruddhacharya, 347
Aravinda 144, 148, 242, 298, 329, 338
Aristotle 144, 148, 249, 259, 330, 360
Atomists, 253
Badarayana 74, 125, 141
Balflour 143
Behaviorists, 366
Bergson 190, 114, 247, 257, 299
Berkeley 247, 256, 331, 343
Bhandarkar 373
Bhartruprapancha 56
Bhaskaracharya 57, 67, 69, 106
Bhattacharya 246, 339
Bradley 251, 255
Buddhism 55, 59, 96, 224, 313, 359, 363, 382
Byron 324
Chaitanya 182
Charvaka 313, 359
Christianity 224, 226
Descartes 254, 257, 297, 360, 366
Evelyn Undersull 300
Emarson 334
Freud 317, 364
Fraud 317, 364
Gallaway 223, 225
Gattulala 53
Gestalt 366
Girdharji 53, 58, 346, 378
Gokulnathji 173, 343
Gopeshwar 378
Harirai 328, 344
Hegel 82, 142, 250, 351, 257, 297
H.O. Shastri 379
Heraclelas 109, 114
Hume 363
Hoffding 339
Islam 226
Ichchharama 348, 378
Jainism 53, 103, 144, 359, 382
James 109, 227, 251, 302, 313, 360
Jayadeo 338
J.C. Wordsworth 241
Joad 144, 308
Jung 317, 369
Kalyanrai 53
Kant 82, 247, 248, 257, 299, 331, 360, 366, 367
Keats 335
Lallubhatta 53, 348
Leibiez 247, 251, 257, 299, 363
Looke 247, 299, 363
M.C. Parekh, 340
Madhavacharya 57, 69, 116, 134, 135
Madhavendrapuri 50
M.T. Teliwala, 379

Mimansa School 53, 59, 62, 101, 128
Nimbarka 57, 67, 69, 76
Nirbhayarama 349
Nyaya-Vaisheshika 53, 59, 94 123, 125
Otto Rothfield 366
Pitambarji 206, 207, 346
P. Johanns 200
Plato 225, 249, 253, 299, 330
Purushottamji 53, 58, 345, 378
Pythogoras 225
Radhakrishnan 64, 143, 145, 146, 299, 302, 350, 352, 357, 358, 369, 371
Radha Mukerjee 309
Ramanuja 21, 56, 57, 62, 65, 69, 77, 103, 106, 115, 116, 134, 136, 159, 235, 253
Ramakrishna Bhatt 348
Ranade 299, 300
Rashdell 143
Samkhya 53, 62, 72, 89, 105, 114, 125, 313 350, 359, 363, 382
Shatesbury, 331
Shamkaracharya 16, 17, 56, 67, 106, 119, 122, 127, 131, 133, 160, 230, 259, 313, 369
Schillar 143
Sponoza 257, 299
Udayana 67
Tagore 297
Tirtha 12
Vijnan Bhikshu 56, 241
Vitthaleshji, 328, 342, 378
Vivekanand 229
Vrajanath 348
Wilson 52
Yog 313, 352, 354, 359, 364

ERRATA

The author craves the indulgence of the reader for any misprints discovered in this work. Some of them have been noted below:

Page	Line	Incorrect	Correct
2	Quotation	Self-efflugent	Self-effulgent
3	2	Gita 8-41	Gita 10-41
7	31	of	or
8	14	delete "or unveiled"	
8	29	repadiated	repudiated
9	25	Mayavidins	Mayavadins
10	3	toward	towards
11	7	querried	queried
13	18	Self-Contradcitory	Self-Contradictory
13	24	delete "Chapter I, Verse I of the"	
13	25	Mandukya	Mundaka (2-2-7)
13	30	Brihadaranyaka(1-5-15)	Shvetashvetara (2-3-16)
13	32	Dscribe	Describe
16	22	Brahman	World
18	31	annointing	anointing
20	4	Rumadeasa	Ramadas
21	6	regardin	regarding
22	6	efective	defective
25	37	mend	mind
26	18	I	It
28	13	hanked	thanked
29	25	aspried	aspired
31	15	qdalification	qualification
32	5	of	or
32	18	refuge	refuge in
32	18	Shrenthens	Strengthens
39	2	Verse X	Chapter XI
42	17	war	was
42	30	Supreme-position	Superimposition

42	35	Delete “Krishna”	
42	36	“Read Lord Krishna”	
43	6	dependends	depends
43	9	Self-dedicattion	Self-dedication
44	12	like	like of
44	29	morolly	morally
48	28	abont	about
49	18	gine	gone
49	36	thaught	thought
52	19	1516-1576 A.D.	1516-1586 A.D.
58	13	pwre	pure
62	38	casual	causal
66	32	Knowleidge	Knowledge
72	32	reevals	reveals
78	20	acrtivity	activity
80	4	On 2-1	on A.B. 2-1
82	23	monifasted	manifested
83	3	Akshata	Akshara
83	30	Hb	He
85	20	Categpares	catagories
86	15	from	form
93	19	casual	causal
95	16	eadr	each
95	23	is accepted	is not accepted
96	6	ffect	effect
96	7	Delete ‘or’	
96	14	Contract	Contact
103	23	place	placing action
103	23	delete “there is no”	
108	4	The-wory	Theory
108	20	Delete ‘on’	
109	1	veolutionary	evolutionary
109	1	The	(6) The
109	2	delete (6)	
109	2	thes	these are
110	13	predictions	predilections
110	23	Brahman	and Brahman
110	30	delete ‘full’	
110	30	froms	forms

113	36	Censciousness	Consciousness
118	2	is	in
120	1	The world	The world is
120	2	hiddenden	hidden
120	27	synominously	synonymously
122	4	manufesting	manifesting
122	6	Godis	God's
122	17	concealed	is concealed
124	9	apear	appear
124	22	b	be
127	24	Welfare of the	Welfare of the society
127	26	themseloes	themselves
128	34	enbodied	embodied
129	29	the of	of the
150	15	snese	sense
152	17	Sacrifiees	Sacrifices
165	3	devisions	divisions
181	23	efiorts	efforts
187	35	live God's	live for God's
187	35	love for	love
191	27	not	it is not
199	15	prefect	perfect
200	13	world	word
208	11	Mnah	Manah
209	6	denomenates	denominates
209	37	Neuptials	Nuptials
216	18	to	in
229	4	evanescnece	evanascence
238	13	Machvacharya	Madhvacharya
240	18	Suppor	Support
260	30	cognation	cognition
273	33	(B.G.X.-32)	(B.G.IX-32)
277	25	Sreligious	religious
283	6	XVII-65	XVIII-66
296	17	K.U. 1-2-23	K.U. 1-2-22
298	32	Whit	with
307	37	evoking	invoking
315	25/26	xa-mire	admire
317	24	allruistic	altruistic

334	36	bullebies	lullabies
335	33	fluite	flute
371	4/5	(XVI.1-2)	(XVI- 1-3)
371	19	Signle mindedly	single mindedly
371	19	signleimudedly	single mindedly
373	7	immenant	immanent
374	1	much spread	spread much
386	11	heaven rain	heaven, rain
394	12	infinitesincally	infinitesimally
396	36	It	It (Part II)
399	6	of	to
399	6	oomplied	complied
407	15	delete 'or'	
407	32	Bhagavrtha	Bhagavatartha
417	8/9	extortation	exhortation
423	14	protection	protector
432	13	of	or
432	38	men	man
432	38	enter	enters
437	9	borne	bear
437	14	six	sex
437	14	supports	support
440	9	Vikrit	Vikrita
445	8	'upto'	and '*ti*'
446	28	appears	appeals
447	32	other	the other
450	2	ideals	ideas
466	5	delete 'of' before 'obligatory'	
469	23	workship	*worship*
470	31	Sollata	Lollata
471	18	J.U.	T.U.
471	19	C.V.	C.U.
471	21	3-2-8., K.M., S.U.	3.-2-3. K.U., Sh.U.
478	16	profil	prolific
486	1	Indian History	the history of Indian Philosophy
486	last line	Gavadekar	Javadekar
496	6	problem of Shatesbury	approach of Shaftesbury
	9	Sponoza	spenoza

Supplementary-Errata

Page No.	*Incorrect*		*Correct*
80	Foot Note No.	2	2. B.S.
80	,,	3	3. 2-1-37
80	,,	4	4. B.S. 2-1-33
81	,,	2	2. B.G. IX–19.
81	,,	4	4. B.U. 2-4-5
87	,,	2	2. III-17-6
87	,,(R.L.)	3	3. R.S.
126	,,	4	4. B.S. 2-3-26
127	,,	4	4. B.S. 2-3-33
128	,,	3	3. B.S. 3-2-38
152	,,	4	4. The Gita XIV
153	,,	1	1. 11-3-43
153	,,	4	4. 1-5-32
154	,,	2	2. B.S. 3-4-3
154	,,	4	4. B.S. 3-4-4
154	,,	5	5. Gita IV-23
154	,,	6	6. B.U. 4-4-22
154	,,	7	7. B.S. 3-4-6
361	,,	1	1. B.G. XII-12-17

Truth about Brahmavada in a nutshell

Every soul works to bring out Ananda (Bliss) which is concealed in him. So also with the material universe which has not only life in it but Ananda also. When the Supreme Being passes His grace, the whole universe may develop Ananda again and every thing will be Sacchidanandic (Being, Consciousness and Bliss). This is Vallabhacharya's truth in a nutshell. To him, Karma, gnana and Bhakti theory is but a little transformed.

* * *

He tells us that we are unhappy because we do not seek to shelter our faith in true divine love. God is all grace. He passes it on to us. Then we begin to drink of the ecstasy of which Sacchidananda is all full. This is Brahmavada Theory. It does not condemn Karma or gnana Marga

Prof. M. G. Shastri

The Doctrine of Grace (Pushti Marga)

The doctrine of Grace receives an enviable position in the Shuddhadvaita School of Vallbabhacharya. Vallabhacharya tells us that the teachings of the Upanishads etc. is non-dualistic. The Highest Reality, according to him, posssses all divine qualities, and does not stand in need of Maya, as in the system of Shankaracharya for assuming the form of the world. The world is, therefore, a reality and not an illusion. Vallabha, after discussing the relative position of Devotion, Knowledge and Action, frankly admits that these well-known means of God-realisation, have lost their efficacy in the modern period on account of unfavourable circumstances and recon.-mends the Divine Grace (Pushti)-the sheet-anchor of helpless souls. The School of Vallabha is, therefore, popularly known as the Pushti Marga, (the path of Divine Grace). Shri Aurbindo, the great mystic of modern India, has also remarkably shown the importance of Divine Grace, in the process of spiritual sublimation.

Prof. G. H. Bhatt

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

The author — Prof. Jethalal G. Shah has a name and fame as a Scholar of merit and devotion. He was born on the 10th Oct. 1894 and had early education in the rural surroundings of Gujarat. With brilliant academic career, he secured his M.A. degree with Gujarati and Sanskrit as special subjects from the University of Bombay in the year 1922. He had a very successful career as a Principal of the S.N.D.T. University College at Ahmedabad (Town where Mahatma Gandhi lived) for a long term with good contribution to his credit in the academic administration Board of of the University as a Member of the Senate, Syndicate, and the acedemic councils. He won N. M. Parmananda prize of the Bombay University in 1921. He has to his credit more than 30 publications. He was the first to publish a critical and analytical treatise on the famous 'Anubhasya'. His commentary on the Tatvadip Nibandha is considered a very valuable contribution. His 'Tamasphala Prakrana' is equally important publication on the Subodhini Bhagwat. The author of all these original Sanskrit treatises is Vallabhacharyaji. He has written nearly 150 articles concerning the philosophy and religion of Vallabhacharya and also many literary subjects.

This volume is a very valuable addition to the literature of profound philosophical character. This is a systematic, interpretative and explanatory account of the Shuddhadvaita Vedanta Philosophy. Prof. Jethalal's exposition on the Tenets of Vallabhacharya with critical analysis and understanding is both scholarly and straightforward. It should prove of equal value as a reference book for the study of comparative philosophy.